AN APOLOGY OF ENGLISH ARMINIANISME

8° OR S. 244. Art. 2

A DIALOGVE, betweene *Iacobus Arminius*, Professour in the Vniuersity of *Leyden* in *Holland*; and *Enthusiastus* an English Doctour of Diuinity, and a great *Precisian*.

WHEREIN

Are defended the Doctrines of Arminius *touching* Freewill, Predestination, *and* Reprobation: *The said doctrines being mantained & taught by many of the most Learned Protestants of* England, *at this present time.*

WRITTEN

By O. N. heertofore of the Vniuersity of Oxford.

Sam: Hinton
Cantab. 1638.
BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

Quoties volui congregare filios tuos, &c. & noluisti? *Matth. 23.*

Qui se existimat stare, videat ne cadat. 1. Cor. 10.

Permissu Superiorum, 1634.

THE ARGVMENT of the Dialogue.

CERTAINE *Gentlemen of Quality, being sent out of* England, *to negotiate with the* States *of* Holland, *touching Publike Affaires, one* Enthusiastus *is appointed (as their Chaplayne) to accompany them. This* Enthusiastus, *being supposed a* Doctour of Diuinity, *made in one of our English Vniuersities, is a Man (as his name importeth) much relying vpon his owne Illuminations frō* God, *touching matters of Faith, and interpretation of Scripture. He is a great* Precisian, *and (though learned) much aduerse to the* Positions, *and* Theses, *maintayned by the* Arminians.

Now this English company lying at the Hage, *and hauing conueniency of leasure,* Enthusiastus *intreateth some of the chiefest of them to accompany him to* Leyden, *being some few houres iourney from the* Hage. *He*

telleth them, that his meaning is, to dispute with Arminius (Professour in that Vniuersity) touching three Questions believed by the Arminians of England. The Gentlemen accord to his request. The questions do concerne Freewill, Predestination, and Reprobation.

At their comming to Leyden, they fynd Arminius, reading his Publike Lecture in the common Schooles of the Vniuersity. The Lecture ended, and salutations done, Enthusiastus acquainteth Arminius with the occasion of himself & his cõpanies repaire thither. Arminius willingly yieldeth thereto. Thereupon they begin a serious disputation touching the former Points of Doctrine, according to their different Tenets of them, in the open Schooles, and eye of the present Auditory. What is the euent of this disputation, the end of the Dialogue relateth.

Thus far concerning the fictiõ of this Dialogue. The Authour whereof supposeth Arminius to be liuing at this present, & to haue read all such Bookes of Protestants, as haue beene written, touching the Questions heere disputed of. All which liberty the Nature of a Dialogue permitteth to any Writer.

THE

THE EPISTLE DEDICATORY,

To the Right Reuerend Lords, the LL. Archbishops of England: And to the right Worshipfull, the Heads, and Maisters of the Colledges of both Vniuersities.

MOST Reuerend *Lords*, and you other *Learned men of our Vniuersities* (vvhose due *Panegyricks*, and *Laudatiues* deserue to proceed from a more skillfull Penne, then mine:) you are not to thinke strange, that I make bould to dedicate this my small *Treatise* to your selues. The reason is manifest, and it is this.

Common Report (and you knovv the vulgar saying, *Vox populi, vox Dei*) though it often erre in its ovvne agitation, hath neuertheleſſe voyced it much throghout this Realme, that diuers of You do entertaine in your iudgments, certaine *Positions* in doctrine, not long ſince reuiued by *Iacobus Arminius*, heertofore the publike *Professour* of *Leyden* in *Holland*: To vvit; 1. *Touching mans hauing Freevvill.* 2. *That no man is infallibly assured of his Saluation.* 3. *That iustifying Fayth may be loſt.* 4. *And finally, that God doth not reprobate any man to damnation, vvithout preuiſion, or reference*

to

to his bad and vvicked vvorkes. Yea ſome of you haue in your publike Sermõs learnedly deſẽded certaine of theſe Points. And of my ovvne knovvledge there are diuers in the *Vniuerſities*, moſt ſtrong in the ſayd doctrines.

The truth of this then being ſo fully acknovvledged, I (vvho do runne one, and the ſame line of doctrine vvith you heerin) haue vndertaken to vvarrant and make good in theſe enſuing leaues, the moſt Ancient, & *Orthodoxall* Verity of the ſaid Points: & therfore in regard of this aſſumed Attempt, my *Ambition* hath embouldned this my *Dedication*.

I presume, that most of you, vvho are Patrones of these *Theorems*, haue already fortifyed your Iudgments (throgh your ovvne Reading) vvith most of the Arguments, produced in this *Treatise*; & therfore in this respect, to You it vvill proue lesse necessary, or profitable. Neuertheless, that those, vvho are *Anomalous*, and irregular Professours among you (as I may terme them,) and vvho through the crookednes of their ovvn paths, do tread different steps from You therein, may see, vpon vvhat grounds (both *Diuine* and *Humane*) the former Articles are seated, and con-

consequently hovv incompatible the contrary *Tenets* are vvith the holy Scriptures; I haue to that end vndertaken this *Prouince*.

The matter is heer deliuered in the forme of a *Dialogue*, as best comporting vvith the fastidious humour of the present times. The Interlocutours are, *Arminius* himselfe (vvhome I suppose to be novv liuing) & one *Enthusiastus* an *Imaginary* English Doctor of *Diuinity*; a man, sufficiētly learned, but a great *Precisian*, & a resolute Enemy to the former Positiōs of *Arminius*. What othervvise this aëry *Doctour* is, You may easely coniecture; since to you

vvho are learned, his name (as comming from the Greeke Verbe ἐνθυσιάζω) is his *Character*. Novv touching the further fiction of this *Dialogue*, I refer you to the *Argument* thereof prefixed before.

If this my labour may become seruiceable to any, I shal hould my selfe sufficiently recompensed: but hovvsoeuer, my cõfort is, that the *Highest* euer setteth a poise more vpon the intention of the Worker, then vpon the vvorke it selfe: & vvell I am assured, that my intention heerin is *Azimous*, and pure, as leuelling only at the spirituall good of others.

That I partly become *Anonymous*,

nymous, or rather (in outvvard shevv) *Fatherleſſe* to this my ovvne *Iſſue*, contẽting my ſelf only (as it vvere) to *Anagrãmatize* my name vnder tvvo letters, your Ingenuity & Cãdour (I hope) vvill pardõ. The maine reaſon of thus masking my ſelf, is this follovving: admitting once the *Author* heerof to be certainley knovvne, vvhat ſallies, and incurſions (more againſt my *Perſon*, then againſt my *Treatiſe*) vould the maintainers of the contrary doctrines make vvith their Pens? And hovv vvould they, and their follovvers (being ſo infinite in number, and vvarranted vvith the ſtreame

&

& current of the rymes) euen shovvre dovvn vvords (of Disgrace, & Cõtumely vpon me) So loath I am to ſtand vvithin the breath of ſuch men.

But novv, *Reuerend men*, I vvill expatiate no further; neither vvill I diſtune your eares vvith any longer diſcourſe; as being more vvilling to ſpread my ſelfe in *Matter*, then in *VVords*. Therefore referring this ſmal vvorke (I could vvish to your *Patronage*) I hope, to your *perusall*, I commit You to the Protection of him, vvho is the Protectour of *Iſrael*, and do reſt,

Yours in all dutifull Obſeruancy,

O. N.

AN APOLOGY OF ENGLISH ARMINIANISME OR A DIALOGVE,

VVherein is proued, 1. That Man hath free will: 2. That no Man is certaine of his owne Saluation: 3. That no man is reprobated, without preuiſion of his VVorks.

The Interlocutors are, *Arminius*, & *Enthuſiaſtus*.

Enthuſiaſtus.

LEARNED *Arminius*; Now after your Lecture is ended, God ſaue you. We were loath to interrupt you in the midle thereof. We haue beene at your lodging to enquire for you, and your

your Seruãts directed vs to these publik Schooles; assuring vs, that we should fynd you reading at this houre. Glad I am, that it hath so fallen out, that my eares haue beene witnesse thereof.

Arminius.

Gentlemen. You are all strangers to me; and therefore I know not how to proportion my resalutatiõ; but yet I will make bould to vse towards you
(1) Pet. 1. those words of Holy Writ: (1) *Gratia vobis, & pax multiplicetur*. Indeed you haue foũd me performing my *Calendary* & weekly task of Reading. I could wish that my Lecture had been worthy your Audience. But I pray you Sir (if so I may make bold) what is the occasion of your, and the rest of your Companies arriuall at this place?

Enthusiastus.

I will relate to you the Motiue of our comming hither. Take notice then, that whereas his *Maiesty of England* (whom God long preserue in a most happy gouerment ouer vs) hath sent ouer certaine Knights, and others of Quality here present (and with them my

my ſelfe) to negotiate with the High Lords *States of Holland*, touching matters of *State*: And hauing ſtayed ſome weekes at the *Hage* without effecting any thing (ſo intricate, and delaying is this πολυπραγμοσυνη of *State-buſines*) & my ſelfe vnwilling to rauell out weeke after weeke in doing nothing, haue taken the aduantage of the Vacancy of ſome few dayes, in cõming with theſe worthy Knights and Gentlemen, to viſit this your Vniuerſity of *Leyden* (being not paſt half a dayes iourney off from vs) and particularly your Selfe.

Arminius.

You are all as welcome, as my power and ability can affoard. I will ſhew you our Vniuerſity before your departure; though indeed it muſt needs appeare in your eyes, but drouping, and of meane eſteeme, in regard of your Two of England, famous throughout all Chriſtendome; in reſpect whereof our poore *Academy* may ſtand, but for a foyle. But Syr, if without offence, I would intreate your Name in particular, ſeeing diſcourſing with men, whoſe names are not knowne, is, as if men

ſhould

should walke togeather in darkness?

Enthusiastus.

My name is *Enthusiastus*; and I am a Doctor (though vnworthy) of Diuinity, created in our owne Vniuersities. And know you further (Worthy *Arminius*) that I haue often heard of you in England; though I could wish, that the report of you had taken its rise, and beginning from some other grounds then it doth. That you are learned; we all know, and by this your *Lecture*, now read, we may rest no lesse assured. But part of your learning resteth (I feare) in maintaining vnwarrantable Assertions, and such as are repugnant to the Word of God.

For it is knowne, that (among other peculiar Doctrines, broached by you) you teach, with a strong deliuery of your selfe therein, That *Man hath Freewill*; that *Iustifying faith may be lost*; and finally, *Vncertainty of Saluation, and Reprobation*: Points, which (I much doubt) no good Professour of the Ghospell doth maintayne. And which is the worst, these your Doctrines by me rehearsed (vpon all which you briefly touched

touched euē now in this your Lecture) haue already inuaded (if Report do not vaynely and idly multiply it selfe) the Iudgments of diuers most remarkable men in *England*; and such, who both for learning and places of dignity which they hould, are in our owne *Euangelicall Sphere*, Stars of the *greatest Magnitude*. Nay the Very stones of our Episcopall and Cathedrall Churches, as also the walls of the Colledges in our Vniuersities (euen in a speaking silence) do *Eccho* forth the great hurt by you perpetrated: *Hinc illæ lachrymæ*.

Furthermore, which I relate with disconsolate sighes and lamentation; Such men in our owne Country, who haue imbraced these your doctrines, do among vs in this respect take their *Denomniation* euen from your Name, they being in the vulgar speach styled, for the better distinguishing them from other more pure mebers of our Church, *Arminians*: A demonstration euicting, that your Doctrines are Innouations; since in euery innouation of doctrine the Professours commonly take their Name from the first Coyner of the same: So true is that saying of Chryso-

(a) Hom. 24. in Act. Apost.

Rome: *Prout* (a) *Hæresiarchæ nomen, ita Secta vocatur*: Pardon, Syr, this my playnesse, & vnfyled words, I pray you.

Now then, seeing I do hould your former doctrines, as incompatible with the Scriptures; Therefore, I confesse, my chiefe Allectiue of Visiting you, (*Arminius*) is to enter into a Scholasticall *Duellisme*, or dispute in all Christian feruour and sobriety: *Pede pes, densusque viro vir*, that so, in the sight of these Gentlemen heere present, I may either alter your iudgment, or be by you altered. But why do I intimate in the least sorte this later, since my owne Profession doth warrant my attempt, and the Illustrious radiancy of the Truth on my syde doth infallibly promise me the better of the day?

Arminius.

Enthusiastus (since it seemes, you so are called) and you *worthy Men* hither accompanying him, I must tell you all, that the Occasion of your Comming to me is most strange, and vnexpected. Yet seeing euery good Christian is obliged (when iust reason therof is presented) to giue an account of his fayth

and

and Religion; *Corde* (3) *creditur ad iustitiam, ore fit Confessio ad salutem*: I shall not, according to my ability, be slow therein. (3) Rom. 10

But before you begin, I must put you in mynd, that where you confesse, that diuers of the Chiefest men in your Country (both for learning and Authority) maintayne my former *Theses* and Positions; this greatly turneth to the honour of my Cause. For why should such eminent and selected Deuines giue their full assent thereto (and this contrary to the present streame & sway of the tymes), but that the doctrines (so intertayned by them) are warrãted with an inexpugnable Truth and Certainty?

Againe, where you say, that such Worthy men (among you) take their denomination from me; and consequently, and by implication you brand me with the odious Name of an *Arch-Heretike*; my answere to you shalbe in all candour and sobriety (for I am vnwilling by way of retaliation to conuitiate you, or to bandy words of disgrace, especially in my owne Vniuersity, and you being but a stranger, since

this would be accounted but *Coridonisme* and Rusticity) that I am assured, you cannot iustly throw vpon me any such imputation. My reason is this: They only from whom others take the appellation for matters of fayth, are to be reputed for Arch-Heretikes, who did first dogmatize, & teach Opinions in fayth neuer before heard, as beliefued by the Church of God: Such were *Arius*, *Eutiches*, *Pelagius*, *Nestorius*, and some others. Now if it can be made good (as I am assured it can) that the former *Tenets* by you mentioned, and by me believed, be concordant to the sacred Scriptures; and were with an vnanimous consent believed by the ancient Church of Christ; then I iustify, that the hatefull name of *Arch-Heretike*, cannot in any sort be appropriated vnto me.

But seing you are determined to enter into a serious dispute (as you say) touching the former Articles; I would willingly know, what Method you intend to keep herein? That is, where you will begin, and whether your selfe will first oppose and obiect, or answere? the choyse whereof, for the greater satisfa-

ction of these Gentlemen (your worthy Associates) I freely giue to you. And lastly, I would know, whether you would rather dispute priuatly or publikely. Yf Priuatly, then if it please you and these Gentlemen to accompany me to my house, you shall enioy (if nothing els, yet) better priuacy of discourse.

Enthusiastus.

O no. Our dispute shalbe open and publike, I meane in these your owne publike Schooles; This shalbe the place of our Conflict, that so in the *Theater* and view, not only of these English Gētlemen, comming with me, but also of this Presence (your owne daily Auditory) you may disauow that fayth, to the which you haue hitherto beene so pitifully enthralled. Here within these Walls the Hurt hath bene committed, and within these walles, I trust by dint of Argument, and by assistance of the Highest (who euer affoardeth his peculiar Illuminations, to his Elect, of which number I am ascertayned, to be one) to force you to disclayme from your former Positions, and thereby

partly to repayre the domage.

Yet before we come to dispute, you must giue me leaue (thereby to affoard a more full passage to my griefe) to tell you, that I much feare, your defence of these interwounding Controuersies, proceeds in you from a thirsty desire to be much spoken of by the tongue of Fame; & so to become *Vir Theatralis*, as placed vpon the stage of the Worlds Eye. The which I am the rather induced to thinke; since you are not content to confyne your said doctrines, within the compasse of these Walles, to your owne Auditory; But withall, to diuulge them in your discoursing Papers; the immateriall (wellings of your Pen.

I will not say, how far better, but I may well say, how lesse hurtfull (in respect of others) it is, to be a secret *Adiaphorist*, or *Neutrall* in Religion (so keeping his poyson to himselfe) then with a certaine Magistrality & assumed Authority to frame & mould such doctrines, which stand so aduerse to the Word of the Lord, as that I may iustly style thē to be *Hyper-hereticall*, as tranceding the nature of ordinary Heresies.

Now

Now then, *Arminius*, you being the *Architect* of such strāge doctrines, the beliefe whereof doth threaten an interminable perdition to the belieuers; it is euident that your Sinne in Teaching is farre more reprouable, then it is in your followers in their Belieuing. The reason being, in that, wheras the ignorant Sectary meerly *Priuatiuely* belieueth not that, which is True: the learned (such as you are) belieueth with a *formed* and *positiue Fayth*, (to speake in a restrayned sense) that, which is false.

I heere passe ouer, with a gentle touch, how in defence of your former doctrines (to the dishonour of your owne Cause) you ouer neerely interleague with the *Papists*, who (as it should seeme by some of their Bookes) equally maintayne with you the said *Paradoxes*. But I will stay my selfe from launcing further in my Reproualls, hauing paid in these my speaches some Tribute and Duty to the Truth, and to my owne feruour: (4) *Zelus domus tuæ comedit me.*

(4) Psal. 68.

Arminius.

This your long (I will not say, te-

dious) Diſcourſe, diſcouereth, that your Name well comports with your owne comportment: but you may take notice, that my Scene is not, fruitleſly to waſt the tyme in vaunting Words; the froath of ſpeach.

Where you ſay, that the defence of my doctrines riſeth from a certaine Vetuoſity, and windy deſire of Prayſe; It ſeemes, you taſt euery thing through your owne enuenomed ſpitle; but I do aſſure you, (to ſpeake in my owne defence) I do little prize this poore weake breath of Mens mouthes. Where you charge me, with inter-leaging (as you call it) with the *Papiſts*; I reply heerto. True it is, that the *Papiſts* do hold the ſayd Articles with vs, but not with the ſame Conditions (I take it) and in the ſame manner.

Agayne, admit there were no diſparity betweene them and vs, touching the belieuing; yet what doth this inforce? Can it be inferred, that becauſe the *Papiſts* beliene them; Therefore we ought not to belieue them? Moſt inconſequently inferred; ſince by this forme of arguing, we ſhould not belieue that there are any *Scriptures*; that

Chriſt

Christ dyed for mans Redemption; that there are three *Persons*, and but one *God*; seeing the *Papists* do beleeue these Articles. But Syr, be not lauish of time, but without further surpluzage of vnnecessary discourse (which doth but obtund mens eares) hasten to dispute: And what I shall be able to produce, eyther in defence of my owne Positios, or in assaulting of yours (though these two points be partly coincident, & interueyre the one the other) the Euent will proue. Therefore I intreat you to beginne. And *Gentlemen* if it please you, you may take your Seates.

Enthusiastus.

Well then: we will proceed thereto. And seeing you leaue it to my Election, I will first dispute and obiect, & will produce most Vnanswerable Testimonies of sacred Writ, deliuered (without the least doubt) by me in the intended sense of the Holy Ghost; *Spiritus, vbi* (a) *vult, spirat.* And I will begin with the Article of *Free will*; in that the Question of *Free will* is a *Cardinall*, & supreme Point, being indeed the hynge, whereupon the other Que-

(a) Ioan. 3.

stions following by necessary inference, do rest, and relye.

Arminius.

I like well of your Method. And you say truly, in calling the Question of *Freewill* a supreme Point at this present, since it being once proued that man wanteth *Freewill*, it the followeth, that there is a certainty of our *Reprobation, Election*, or *Predestination*. As also on the contrary part, if it can be demonstrated, that man hath *Freewill*, then of necessity from thence may be inferred, that there is no certainty of *Predestination*, or *Reprobation*.

But now to come to the subiect, of which in the first place you vndertake to dispute, I hold it expedient, that we first both agree of the definition of *Freewill*, and of other cautions necessarily conducing to euery act, flowing from *Freewill*; the which being set downe afore, and circumstanced with due restrictions, and so acknowledged by vs both, my prelaging thoughts foretell me, that you will but idly diuerberate the ayre, in alleadging the most of your Scripturall Authorities;

since

since the Answeres to them you shall fynde to be vertually involued in the said definition, cautions, and explications.

And first to begin with the definition. The Deuines (b) do defyne *Free-will* to be: *A faculty of Reason and the Will, by the which Good is chosen, through Gods grace assisting; or Euill, through the absence of the same Grace.* Now for the better explication of this *Definition*, we are *first* to vnderstand, that *Freewill* can choose *euill* of it selfe; but *good*, through the assistance and cooperation of Gods grace. *Secondly*, that *Freewill* belongeth only to an Intelligent and Rationall Nature; to wit, to God, Angels, and men. *Thirdly*, that *Freewill* is exercised only about *Meanes* conducing to an End, and not about the *End* it selfe. *Fourthly*, that *Freewill* consisteth in choosing one thing before another; and consequently, where there is no diuersity of things, there the Freedome of the will cannot be exercised. *Fiftly*, that the freedome of *will* requyreth a freedome, not only from *Coaction* and constraint, but also from all *Necessity*; so as the will is with no necessity caried

(b) *Aug. in Enchirid. c. 106.*

to

to choose this rather the that, but may choose whether it selfe will.

Thus much for the greater illustration of the definition of *Freewill*; and what *Freewill* is in its owne Nature. Now where you say, that you will begin with producing in the first place your Testimonies from the Holy Scriptures, (as justly they deserue the first place, and all precedency) for the impugning of *Freewill*; therefore as aboue I intimated, I will set downe afore, other certaine, true, and acknowledged Cautions, which I trust being truly ballanced, will obtund and blunt the edge and force of the said Authorities, as being alleadged through meere detortion, and misapplication of them.

Of these cautionary Annotations, the *first* is, that the liberty of the will doth not exclude the cooperation, and helpe of God; nor Gods working excludes *Freewill*. Seeing, though the cooperation of God be euer presupposed, yet it is in our power to choose this or that, & therefore that sentence is most true; *God worketh all our workes, but yet not without vs*, that is, not without our free Consent thereto.

Secondly, we are to conceaile, that God in cooperating with vs in our Actions, worketh either *efficienter* (as the School-Deuines do speake) yet this by the interueniency of some *forme*, imprinted by God in our wills; to wit, by powring into vs his Grace, by which he encline th our will to good Actions; or els God worketh in our wills *Obiectiuè, & efficaciter*, yet so as this efficacy proceedeth not so much from the force of the persuasion of God in vs, as from the disposition of our will, the which disposition God foreseeth. This is meant, when God propoundeth any thing through internall persuasion, & that he seeth the will is apt to consent thereto. And Gods working in our wils, by eyther of these two former wayes, is no hinderance to the Freedome of our will, since (admitting eyther of these kinds of Gods working within vs) the Will still remaynes free to choose this, or that; or to choose, or not to choose at all.

The *last* Animaduersion may be, that there is great difference betweene Freedome of *Election*, and freedome of *Execution*. The first is euer necessary to

Free-

Freewill, but not the freedome of ex-
ecution: fince not only God, but ma-
may hinder the execution of that,
which one hath chosen and made e-
ction to doe, and yet the freedome
the Will is in no sort frustrated, or le-
ned thereby. Now these Cautions b-
ing premised, you may (*Enthusiastus*)
begin at your pleasure, to draw yo-
Authorities out of Gods holy Wor-
for the impugning of *Freewill*.

Enthusiastus.

All these your *Paraphrasticall* obs-
vations I allow well of; they bei-
founded partly in *Divinity*, and part-
in force of Nature: notwithstanding
hope to produce such cleare and m-
suing passages of Scripture, as throu-
their evidency, they cannot by an-
meanes be detorted; and through the
force and strength they cannot be an-
swered.

And first I alleadge that text, whe-
(c) Ioan. 6. it is said: (c) *No man can come to me, un-
the Father, that sent me, draw him.* And th-
Apostle inculcateth the same thing sa-
(d) 2. Cor. 3. ing: (d) *We are not sufficient of our selv-
to thinke any thing, as of our selves; but*

our sufficiency is of God. Againe, it is said in the Scripture: (e) *It is God that worketh in you both to will, and to accomplish.* What say you to these texts, before we alleadge any other?

(e) Philip. 2.

Arminius.

I reply, that all these places are illustrated (as making nothing against *Freewill*) from one of the Cautions aboue expressed. For we teach, that the freedome of the Will is not by Nature to do any good worke, but only by Grace: therefore in that one commeth to Christ, this is effected by the Will of man, cooperating with the Grace of God, and not otherwise.

But (*Enthusiastus*) in my indgement it had beene more conuenient to haue forborne the alleaging of this first place, seeing *Chrysostome* introduceth the *Manichees*, (who denyed *Freewill*) alleadging this text in defence of their doctrine, and then himselfe answereth in these wordes: (f) *No man commeth to me, except my Father, who sent me, draw him. Here the Manichees ryse vp, contending by testimony of this text, that we can doe nothing of our selues; but this taketh not*

(f) Chrysost. in Ioannem Hom. 45. versus finem

away

away our free will, but sheweth that it needeth Gods help. Now I hold it a blemish to you, to compart with those, (who were condemned in the Primitiue Church) not only in their doctrines but also in their proofes of the said doctrines, since it implyeth, that the best weapons, wherewith you impugne the truth, are borrowed from the confessed Enemyes of the Truth.

The *second* passage alleadged, by retortion makes wholy against you, and in behalfe of me, for it admitteth, that we haue sufficiency: Only the Apostle teacheth vs, that our sufficiency to thinke any good thing, is not of ourselues, that is, by force of *Nature*; but through the help and ayd of God, that is, by force of Gods *Grace*, assisting mans will therein. And according hereto *M. Perkins* thus writeth: (g) *When God commandeth men to repent, at the same time by his grace he enableth them both to will, and to desire to repent, as also actually to repent*.

not answer

(g) In his reformed Catholike pag. 27.

To the *third* text. The answere thereto is grounded vpon the former Caution, or Annotation: for God worketh in vs both to will, and to accomplish by his

his Grace, but he worketh not this without our owne cooperation therin. Now Gods working, & mans working are two different thinges: neither are they in themselues incompatible, but may stand together. This is necessarily euicted out of the words immediatly aforegoing in the same place: *With feare and trembling worke your saluation.* And therfore the foresaid *M. Perkins* truly thus writeth: (h) *Mans free will concurres with Grace, as a Co-worker; and being mooued by Grace, it acteth, and moueth it selfe.* A poynt so euident, that *Austin* himselfe answereth this very text in these wordes: (k) *Non quia dixit &c. Not because it is said, it is God that worketh in you both to will and to accomplish, that therfore he may be thought to take away free-will from man &c.* Thus far of these places, which receaue one and the same answere.

(h) In his reformed Cath. pag. 14. vid. pa 16.

(k) Aug. tom. 7. de gratia & libero arbitrio. c. 9.

By this now (*Enthusiastus*) you may see, how rouingly they are alleaged by you, against the doctrine of *Freewill*. But to these you may also range (if you will) these following texts of Scripture, produced by diuers for the impugning of *Freewill*, they receauing

their full ſatisfaction from the anſwers giuen to theſe laſt. The Texts are theſe: (l) *Thou O Lord haſt wrought all our workes in vs.* And againe: (m) *One ſparrow ſhall not fall vpon the ground without your Father.* And yet more: *Who worketh all things after the Counſell of his owne will.* beſides the like Text *in Rom. c. 11, & 1. Cor. 12.* And laſtly, where it is ſaid. * *Let our harts ſo encline to thee, that they may keepe thy commandements.*

(l) Iſa. 26.

(m) Matt. 10.

* 3. Reg. 8.

Enthuſiaſtus.

Well, (*Arminius*) if this my firſt encounter hath not beene forcible inough to batter downe the walls of your Innouations; yet I truſt my ſecond charge ſhall proue more powerfull, or rather irreſiſtable: what then ſay you to theſe following Comments of Texts, (for ſo in regard of their perſpicuity, I may rather tearme them, then Texts themſelues) as where it is ſaid: (n) *I know that the way of man is not in himſelfe, neither is it in man to walke, or direct his ſteps.* And againe: (o) *The ſteps of man are ruled by the Lord, how can a man then vnderſtand his owne way?* And more: (p) *The hart of man purpoſeth his way,*

(n) Ierem. 10.

(o) Prou. 20.

(p) Prou. 16.

way, but the Lord directeth his steps. Lastly: (to omit some others for breuity)
(q) The preparations of the Hart are in man, but the answere of the tongue is in the Lord. See you not (Arminius) how these Texts (as so many murthering Pieces) do play vpon the weake fort of mans *Freewill*? (q) Prou. 16.

Arminius.

Good *Enthusiastus*, I partly pitty you, to see your iudgment thus sealed vp rather with preiudice, then cleared with force of proofe. For here againe I recurre (as to my *Asylum*, or Sanctuary) to the state of the question, and the Cautions aboue expressed, and by vs both acknowledged. For there we learne, that there is great disparity betweene mans *Freewill*, and the execution of that, of which the *Freewill* maketh choyse to will. The Execution of the thing, which we will, is not euer in our power; and this only (though to our purpose meerely impertinent) these former sacred Scriptures do euict: but the freedome of the will (which is only in question betweene vs) they do not at all touch, much lesse ouerthrow.

Yea which is more, some of these very Texts by you vrged, do rather proue the freedome of the will (so oftentimes it happens, that a man finds a weapon, by which another wounds him:) for where it is said; *The preparations of the Hart are in man*; And againe; *The Hart of man purposeth his way*, &c. what other construction can these receaue, then that man through the freedome of his owne will prepares his hart, and purposeth his way; though the Execution & actuall performance of those points are not euer in his owne power? Therefore we must remember, that only *to will* and *not to will*, (and not actually to performe the thing willed, or not willed) is the *true Obiect of Free will*.

Thus far (*Enthusiastus*) where you fynd your selfe deceaued in producing these former passages of Holy Writ, since they in no sort proue any thing against the true Tenet of *Free will*, neither immediatly, and expresselly, neither by any Inferentiall deductions: so certaine it is, that your murthering pieces (of which you afore vaūted) are charged but with certaine Paper-bullets of strayned and wrested Authorities.

ties. But if it please you, proceed further in this your offensiue war; I meane in your assault against *Freewill*, & I shal vse the best meanes of defence, I may.

Enthusiastus Arminius.

I do assure you, your answeres are vnexpected, and make my mynd (I will not say my iudgement) a little to fall, and let downe. But I will proceed further: for admitting, that the former Texts do but idly diuerberate the ayre, (as aboue you said) for want of true application, yet if there be but any One Text of Scripture, which in the true construction thereof doth clearly impugne the doctrine of *Freewill*, then is your cause wholy become prostrate, and leuelled with the ground.

These then other passages I vrge. As first: (r) *Part of the army went with him* (*viz.* Saul) *whose harts God had touched.* In like sort: (s) *The Kings hart is in the hand of the Lord, he turneth it whithersoeuer it shall please him.* To these places diuers others might be ranged, as where it is said: (t) *I will giue vnto you a new hart, and I will make; that you shall walke in my precepts.* And that other passage: (u) *In-*

(r) 1. Reg. 10.

(s) Prou. 21

(t) Ezech. 36.

(u) Psal. 118.

cline my hart to thy testimonies. The like text whereto, is in the Booke of the *Kings. Now from all these it vnauoydably is inferred, that it is God alone without any concurrence of our selues, which worketh all good in vs: so cleare are these sacred Testimonies for the taking away of all *Freewill* in man.

* 3. Reg. 8.

Arminius.

Enthusiastus; It is the true application of Scripture, and not a gallantry of vanting wordes, which must ouercome me in this question: And therefore as to the Texts aboue by you alledged, so also to these last the answere is potētially included in the former state of the question of *Freewill*, and in the annexed Annotations. For it is aboue expressed, that God worketh in all our wils, either for the desiring of any thing, or for the flying from any thing; but yet he so worketh, without any impeachment to the liberty of our will: for though God doth worke in vs, yea sometimes infallibly, yet our *Freewill* is in no sort endangered thereby; the reason hereof being (as is aboue intimated)

ted:) in that the infallibility ryseth not from the vehemency of Gods motion, but from the preuision, and foresight of the readines of the will, to concurre with his inspiration. For God encly-neth not the hart of man by forcing it, but only by inuiting by his inspira-tions: yet so, as that it is in the power of the Will to consent, or not consent to Gods inspirations. But certaine it is, that Gods preuision, and freewill are compatible, and the one is no bar to the other. Now, apply this Annotation to these last texts of Scripture, and you shall fynd how easily your supposed difficulty touching the said Authori-ties, and mans *Freewill*, is loosed and dissolued.

Enthusiastus.

Well (*Arminius*) if I should grant, that for the present, I could not reply to your answeres giuen against all the former diuine Authorities, (which ad-mitting, I am rather to ascribe it to my owne defect, then to any defect in the said Authorities, for prooffe of the point intended:) Yet what answere can you shape to these seuerall Texts of

Scripture, by which we are taught, that we are *dead to sinne*, and consequently that mans will is euer languide, and faynt (through want of power and freedome) to rayse it selfe to any spirituall actiõs: as where it is said: (x) *You, who were dead in trespasses and sinnes &c.* And agayne we thus read: (y) *When we were dead by sinne &c.*

(x) Ephes. 2

(y) Ibidem.

Arminius.

The transparency of this obiection euen an ordinary eye can pierce; for as the Text sayth: *We are dead by sinne*; so also it addeth in the places alleaged, that *we are quickned in Christ*. Which addition importeth, that though of our selues we are not able to performe any spirituall actions; yet Christ hath so *quickned* vs with his preuenting Grace, as that therby we are made able to produce the said spirituall actions: & thus, this *quickening in Christ*, implyeth only an infusion of Gods Grace, (which I willingly acknowledge) but not a taking away of the freedome of mans will: so wildly (as I may say) these two passages of Scripture are shot by you, still glancing vpon one point or other,

not answered

imper-

impertinent to the controuersy ventilated betweene vs. But I pray you (*Enthusiastus*) proceed further in your Scripturall proofes.

Enthusiastus.

I must confesse, that the most forceing authorities of sacred Scripture, which either I, or my partners can alleadge for the impugning of *Freewill*, are already drawne out by me. And though some other Texts might be insisted vpon, yet I foresee the answere to them in your iudgment, might be appropriated out of the former Animaduersions. But (*Arminius*) grant, for the tyme, that the Scripture doth not expresly and articulately condemne the doctrine of *Freewill* for Heresy; doth it therefore follow, that the doctrine therof is Orthodoxall? Most inconsequently inferred. The Turkish Religion, and the many Heresies registred by *Epiphanius*, *Austin*, *Ierome*, and other Fathers of those early tymes, are not punctually and literally condemned by Gods Holy Writ (for hardly could they be condemned particulerly by the Scripture, they rising many ages

after the Scripture was written) and yet no man will from thence conclude that those doctrines, or Religions are true.

The like we may say heere touching the doctrine of *Freewill*. For the truth of the point here is, that a doctrine or Article of fayth is to receaue its warrant, not because the Scripture doth not in particuler *anathematize* the said doctrine; it by omission speaking nothing thereof at all: but the said doctrine receaues its authority, in that it receaueth from the Scripture certaine euident and affirmatiue proofes for the defence of the said doctrine in particuler. Therfore (*Arminius*) except you be able (as I presume you are not) to fortify, and establish the Doctrine of *Freewill* with some cleare, euident, and vnanswerable Texts of Scripture, your cause is nothing aduantaged, though the former diuine passages aboue produced, do not so vnauoydably (as I first perhaps expected they should) confute the doctrine of *Freewill*.

Arminius.

This which you speake of the Scriptures

tures passing ouer in silence any doctrine, or confirming the contrary doctrine by euident proofes, is in part true, I grant, though it be alleaged by you at this present meerly as a subterfugious euation, because you are not able to produce so much as One Text, to impugne our doctrine withall. Though at other times you, and yours do cry out with great exaggeration in wordes, that the doctrine of *Freewill* is most repugnant to the Holy Scriptures; the maintayners therof being deadly wounded with euery splinter of the seuerall passages thereof: so variable and seuerall is your comportment herein, at seuerall tymes.

Now whereas you say, it is more peculiarly incumbent vpon me, affirmatiuely to fortify the doctrine of *Freewill* by euident Texts of Scripture, or els the doctrine therof to be abandoned, as false and erroneous; I do agree with you herein, and am ready to fortify the sayd doctrine with choaking and Vnanswerable places of those diuine writings, if so your selfe hath already finished your *Scene* of obiecting.

Enthu-

Enthusiastus.

I will presently surrender the fu
ction of Opponécy to you. For I gran
that there ought to be according to
methode of Schooles certaine vicissitu
des & alternations of turnes betwee
the parties disputant. Neither is it
reason iustifiable, that the one sy
should be forced to maintayne only
defensiue, and neuer an offensiue wa

But before I end, I must tell you, th
the chiefe Doctor of Christs Churc
since the Apostles (I meane *Austin*)
most strong in the deniall of *Free wi*
For thus he writeth: (y) *Conditoris v*
luntas, rerum necessitas est. The will and th
mynd of the Creator, is the Necessity
thinges. Againe: (z) *That is necessarily*
come to passe, which God willeth, and tha
are truly hereafter to be, which God fore
seeth. And lastly, omitting some othe
passages; (a) *Libero arbitrio male vten*
homo, & se perdidit, & seipsum. Man (mea
ning our first parent) *by vsing Free wi*
badly, did both loose therby himselfe, an
Free will.

(y) Lib. 6. de Genes. ad literam. cap. 25.

(z) V bi supra. c. 17.

(a) In Enchirid. c. 30.

Armi-

Arminius.

How easily is the cloud heere dis-
pelled. For the meaning of the two first
places is, that what God will haue to
come to passe, is infallibly to come to
passe; yet speaking of mans actions, it
commeth to passe with the freedome
of mans will: For God doth not destroy
Nature first created by him, but will,
that euery thing should be effected in
such manner, as best sorteth to the *Na-*
ture of the thing.

To the third place, I answere, That
our *first Father* is said to haue lost *Free-*
will; because by his fall the *Freewill* of
man was made more feeble, and faynt.
For that *Austins* meaning is not, that
Freewill was absolutely lost by *Adam*
(as though it neuer after were to be
in rerum natura) appeareth from those
other wordes: *& se perdidit.* For *Adam*
did not loose himselfe, by any extin-
guishment of himselfe, or not after be-
ing; but because *Adam* thereby was
made far more worse, his *Freewill* being
nothing so vigorous, and actiue, as
before it was.

Enthu-

Enthusiastus.

I will not much labour, in seeking to enervate these your answeres, but they shall passe, as matters hanging in suspense. But there is one difficulty drawne from *force of reason*, which euen arresteth my iudgment, from giuing assent to your doctrine. And this is, the great repugnancy, which is betweene Gods *foreknowledge*, and *Freewill*: For if God do foresee such a thing will be, then certainly it must be: and if certainly it must be, where then is mans *Freewill* in doing, or not doing the same thing?

Arminius.

This doubt is partly aboue vnfoulded: but to answere more particularly thereto. The prescience and *foresight* of God is most certaine, and yet that it importeth no necessity of things to come, is thus proued, euen from the authority of *Austin*, who thus disputeth. (b) Yf the foreknowledge of God do impose a necessity to things future, this falleth out, either as it is absolutely a *foreknowledge*, or els becauſe it is

(b) *De libero arbitrio l. 3. c. 3.*

in particuler the *foreknowledge of God*. Not the firſt, becauſe it would vpon the ſame ground follow, that not only the foreknowledge of God, but the foreknowledge of man ſhould impoſe the like neceſſity to thinges. But this later point is moſt falſe: for example, if it were reuealed by diuine power to a man, that the next day it would rayne, yet this mans foreknowledge is not the cauſe of the rayne, and yet no doubt it would rayne, but no leſſe contingently, then if the mā had not foreknowne the ſame at all.

Neither the *foreknowledge*, or preuiſion of God, I meane, as it is particularly of God, impoſeth any neceſſity to thinges. And the proofe hereof is this: As God foreknoweth, not only what man hereafter will do; ſo alſo, he foreknoweth what himſelfe hereafter will doe. And yet Gods preſcience doth not force God to do that, which he will do. Neither therefore vpon the ſame reaſon, doth his foreknowledge force man in his actions. Againe: God did foreſee the fall of *Adam*; and yet in the iudgmēt of the chiefeſt Deuines, *Adam* had *Free-will* before his fall.

Enthu-

Enthusiastus.

But how commeth it to passe, that those thinges, which are certainly foreknowne, haue euer the euent, when yet they are effected contingently (as you say) and may in that respect not be at all?

Arminius.

The reason heerof is: Because who foreknoweth a thing heerafter to be effected, doth in his vnderstanding precurre, or preuent the effecting of the thing, and beholdeth it as done, before it be done: but that which is done cannot be vndone; although it be effected voluntarily, or contingently. But to conclude this poynt; the concordancy of Gods prescience with Free-will is so acknowledged, euen by the Deuines, as that *D. Willet* thus plainely writeth heerof: (c) *God foreseeth, but willeth not sinne.*

(c) D. Willet in Synops. p. 809.

Enthusiastus.

Indeed there is no such repugnancy after the true ballancing of the difficulty, betweene Gods prouision and

Free-will,

Freewill, as at the first it appeareth to be; whereby we may learne, that that sentence is true: (*) Δεύτεραι φροντίδες σοφώτεραι. But I do find a farre greater labour to reconcile *Gods Cooperation* with mans *Freewill*, so, as they may both stand togeather, and not exile and banish one the other. For since God hath decreed from all eternity, what shalbe, or what shall not be, I see not how any place can heer be left for *Freewill*.

(*) *Secũdæ cogitationis, prudentiores.*

Arminius.

O (*Enthusiastus*) you must not measure the Mysteries of Christianity by the false yard of *Naturall reason*, or mãs capacity: For though demonstratiuely we were not able to reconcile *Gods cooperation* & *Freewill*, yet neither of them are therefore to be denyed, if so ech of them receaue their particuler warrant from the word of God.

Notwithstanding for your greater satisfaction (*Enthusiastus*) I will set downe one way (among others) by which in the iudgment of the greatest Deuines, Gods cooperation and mans freedome of Will are reconciled. For thus they teach: To wit, that the *Diuine*

Cooperation doth beare it selfe, with reference only to the *Effect* and not to the *cause*: whereby is vnderstood, that the concourse of God doth not determine our will, neither doth it worke vpon the will, but flowes only into the *Effect*, produceth the Effect in the same moment, in the which it is produced by our Will: And yet the same Effect could not be produced, if eyther *Gods Cooperation*, or *Mans Will* were wanting. They illustrate this sentence from two, which beare a great stone, the which stone the of one them could not carry, neither of those two men giueth force to the other, nor impelleth the other, and it is in the free choyce of them both to leaue this burden. The like falleth out in the *Cooperation of God*, and *Mãs Will* in the producing of any thing.

And thus much of this point; only before I end, I must tell you, that it seemeth strange to me, to obserue your humility (as I may terme it) in descending to the former Argumentes, drawne from humane Authorities and naturall reason: Seeing diuers of your iudgement in the Question of *Freewill*, and the inferentiall Conclusions resulting

ting from thence, will in great vendi-tation & bravery of speach vndertake to proue all such their assertions only from the sacred word; scorning with a supercilious looke all other kind of proofes deduced, either from the Fathers, frō Naturall Reason, or from any other humane authority whatsoeuer.

Enthusiastus.

Well (*Arminius*) I see heere, what the judgement of the chiefest Deuines are in this point. But now I will proceed no further in producing any more kinds of proofes; It then resteth vpon you, to vndergoe the like labour, by prouing from the Scriptures and other Authorities, the Doctrine of *Freewill*; Begin then at your pleasure.

Arminius.

I imbrace willingly that imposed labour, in the prosecuting whereof, I will draw my first proofes from Reason; that done, I will next ryse to human Authorities; and lastly I will firmely entrench, or anchour my cause vpon the infallible authority of Gods sacred Writ; thus by ascending by de-

grees in proofes, I will consequently ascend in the weight of the proofes, produced from the said Authorities.

1. And to begin. My first argument shall be this: *Let vs* (l) *take away by supposall Freewill from man; then wil shall we take away all punishment due for perpetrating of Sinne; and rewards for the exercise of Vertue.* But this last point stands not with the practise, not only of Priuate men, but of all good Common wealths, who euer retaliate Vertue with rewards, and Vice with punishments.

(l) *Augustl. 14. de vera Religione.*

Enthusiastus.

This your first argument is in my iudgment, but diaphorous, & transparent. For * it followeth not, that man should not be punished, if he hath not *Freewill*; the reason hereof being, in that the punishment is due to the offence, which offence is yet remayning in vs, and indeed taketh its whole emanation from our selues.

(*) So answereth *Caluin l. Instit. 2. c. 3.*

Arminius.

Howsoeuer (*Enthusiastus*) you alleuiate and sleighten the force of this argument, yet is it insisted vpon by *Chrysostome,*

Sostome, Ierome, and finally is grounded vpon force of Reason. Now more particularly to answere hereto, I say, that in your Answere you offend in the *Paralogisme*, or *Fallacy* in Logick, commonly called *Petitio Principij*, since you assume that as granted, which yet is in controuersy. For you in your dispute do presume, that the fault doth remaine and flow from vs, although we be forced through necessity to the working thereof, and that it is not in our power to auoyde Sinne; so fouly you see you are mistaken in this your seeming answere. But I will proceed to a second Argument.

Exyle * *and banish from man Free-will, exyle with all, all kinds of Counsels, and precepts among men, as Exhortations, and persuasions to Vertue, all prayse due to the workers thereof; as also on the contrary side all dehortations and rebukes touching the perpetrating of Vice and Impiety; since to what end tend these exhortations, persuasions, reprehensions, precepts &c. if so men cannot do otherwise, then they do?*

(*) Aug. l. de vera relig. c. 14.

(*) So answereth Caluin l. 2. c. 5.

Enthusiastus.

I answere, * That dehortations and repro-

reproualls, or obiurgations are very profitable, though man wanteth *Free-will*; since they are deseruedly applyed to the wicked, as a scourge to their consciences in this life; and as a testimony in the next life, wherby they rest inexcusable at the last day in the sight of God. In the like sort, Exhortations &c. are applyed to the Elect, to the end, that as by the inward spirit they are illuminated, that so externally they may be stirred vp to the hearing of the word: so by these outward meanes they may be more prepared for the receauing of the grace of God.

Arminius.

Heere agayne the second time (*Enthusiasta*) you fall in to the former ditch (blush you not thereat?) I meane you commit the foresayd *Elench* of *Petitio principij*. For you heer agayne take as granted, that that is truly and properly Sinne, which is necessarily committed by man: but this is the mayne controuersy betweene you and vs: for we eternally deny, that what of necessity is committed, that can be properly Sin. Now out of this your *Hypothesis* & supposall,

posall, you *Ideate*, and frame to your selfe those aëry and imaginary Ends, whereunto are directed (as you say) exhortations, dehortations, prayse, disprayse, precepts, and the like, towards the Elect, and the wicked. For it is most certaine, that reprehensions, and correptions cannot be a scourge to the conscience of those, who want *Freewill*.

Furthermore in confirmation of this Argument, I demand, why we vse not to *Infants*, and *mad-men* cohortations to Vertue, and dissuasions from vice, but only to men of rype age, and such as be in perfect state in their wits? No other reason can be giuen heereof, but that *Infants* and *Mad-men* (after the manner of beasts) are caried with a naturall instinct, and innate impetuosity, neyther can they otherwise worke; whereas men of rype age, and enioying their wits, do chuse through freedome of Will, what they will doe, and is in their power, if they will, not to chuse at all. This Argument aboue is so forcible and pressing, as that I fynd it vsed by (d) *Austin*. But I will proceede forward.

My third Argument. (*) *Either*

(d) *L. de vera relig. c. 14.*

(*) *August. vbi supra.*

Sinne is necessary, or voluntary. If necessary, then it is no Sinne, and then by this, Sinne should be no Sinne, (which is impossible to be:) If Voluntary, then may Sinne be auoyded, and consequently man hath Freewill; as being a Creature, in whose power it is to sinne, or not to sinne.

Enthusiastus.

I peremptorily deny the inference, that Sinne if it be necessary, is no Sinne. For the (*) Diuell doth euer necessarily worke euill, and yet he sinneth; as on the contrary side, the Angels & Saints of Heauen do necessarily worke well, and yet their workes are truly good.

(*) So Calvin ubi supra.

Arminius.

This your Answere is most languid and weake, for this ensuing Reason: The Angels and the Deuill, with reference to the last *end*, haue not *freedome of Will*, to wit, as it is free from *Necessity*; but only as it is free from *coaction*, and constraint. Nevertheless, with reference & respect to the *Means*, their freedome of Will is free, euen from Necessity, seeing they doe many thinges,

thinges, which are in their power not to doe; and forbeare to doe some thinges, which they may (if they will) doe. And in doing of these thinges the Diuels do truly sinne, and Angels worke a laudable worke; yet can neither the punishment due to the one, or essentiall reward due to the other increase thereby, seeing both of their states are *in termino*, and therein al their workes do belong eyther to their damnation, or eternall felicity. But to leaue this point as sufficiently solued, (and the rather, seeing it was explaned aboue in the definition of *Freewill*; to wit, that *Freewill* hath reference to *Media*, and not to *fines*; to wit, not to the *end*, but to *meanes* conducing to the End) I will haste to my last Reason, which I hould as a sealing argument; since the force of it is euen characterred in ech mans Soule, by the fynger of God himself.

We read, euen in great and legible letters, written in the bookes of our owne Consciences, that before such tyme, as our Soule (through daily custome of Sinne, obliterating wholy her fayre impressions stamped in Baptisme) is become a Slaue and thrall to

Sinne, when we through frailty do fall into Sinne, in the tyme of temptation, we often shew great reluctation and resistance to commit it, and by our happy resistance we fynd a secret ioy in our Soules: as on the other syde, by giuing our vnfortunate assent thereto, we are thereby touched with an inward remorse, and prouoked to a vertuous anger (as I may say) against our selues. Now, what do this secret fretting and grudging, and this worme of remorse enforce, but that it was wholy in our owne power to resist our giuing of assent to such wicked temptations?

This is the *Lecture*, which euery man liuing reades in the opened booke of his owne actions. And therefore I confidently conclude, that it may be accounted almost miraculous, that a man fynding this proceeding of the Soule in morall Actions, I meane touching Vice or Vertue, (his owne experience dictating the same to him) should nethertheles be perswaded, that he hath not freedome of Will. And with this, I will passe towards other kinds of Proofes.

Enthusiastus.

Well (*Arminius*) I hould this your last Reason not to be altogeather neglected, since (as you say) our owne experience is otherwise able to chek our judgment therein. But I pray you ryse vp to other kinds of proofes.

Arminius.

I will. And the next head, from whence I will draw my proofes, shall be from the Confessions of the learned Protestants, diuers of which euen ouerborne with multitude of conuincing Authorities, haue in the closure of all, abandoned your doctrine herein, and entertayned our Positiue Article of mans *Freewill*. So as here (*Enthusiastus*) I may say in the words of Holy Writ, (c) *De ore tuo te iudico*; I conuince you from the authority of such men, whom your selues do (and most deseruedly) highly esteeme. (c) *Luc.* 19.

And first may occurre *Castalio*, who reprehendeth *Beza* himselfe for his corrupt translating of the first Chapter of S. Iohn. *v.* 12. To wit; *As many as receaued him, he gaue power to be made the Sonnes*

Sonnes of God; which *Beza* trāslated, *dignity*. Castalio his words are these: *Ioannis c. 1. vi. 12.* (f) *Pulcherrimum maximique momenti locum deprauat &c. The fayre and forcing place of the first of Iohn Beza deprauеth, thus conuerting it: As many as receaued him, he gaue them dignity to be made the Sonnes of God: ἐξουσία enim est potestas, nunquam dignitas &c. But the word ἐξουσία (heere vsed) signifyeth power, but neuer dignity &c. Now seing Beza would not, that Christians should haue the power from Christ, what other thing is this, then to enuie at the benefits of Christ bestowed vpon Christians?* Thus far *Castalio*.

(f) *In defens. Translat. pag. 183.*

To this former learned man I may adioyne the authority of *M. Perkins* herein (though at other times he may seeme partly to fluctuate, and wauer in his iudgment touching this point.) He thus plainly writeth (a sentence elswhere by me alleadged.) (g) *Because God giues men commandement to repent and believe, therefore they haue power to repent and believe*; (h) *God with his commandement giuing grace, that the thing prescribed may be done.*

(g) In his reformed Catholike. p. 26.

(h) *Vbi supr. p. 52.*

Molinaeus (the learned Protestant)

is

is so full in the doctrine of *Freewill*, as that *Peter Martyr* rebuketh him therefore in these wordes. (i) *Molinæus adiudgeth certaine thinges amisse, touching Freewill*.

In like sort *Hemingius* and *Snecanus* (Protestants of good Note) are charged by *D. Willet* for their maintayning of *Freewill*, in this manner: (k) *They* (he meaning the former two Protestants) *are more erroneous concerning Freewill, then are the Papists*. Briefly, this doctrine of *Freewill* is fully taught by (l) *Ostander*, and by certaine Protestants recorded by (m) *M. Fox*: so strong and resolute (we see) are many learned Protestants in this doctrine.

(i) In his Epistles annexed to his common Places, englished in his *Epist.* to Caluin, *pag.* 99.
(k) In his Synops. *p.* 808. & 810.
(l) *Cent.* 16. *pag.* 814.
(m) *Act. Mon. pag.* 1533. & 1605.

Enthusiastus.

The Authority of these former Protestants doe not much sway with me, seeing, that (as your selfe cannot but know) there are many other more in number, and of equall learning at least with the former, who wholy impugne the Doctrine of *Freewill*; and to whose judgments therein I had rather stryke sayle, and yield.

Arminius.

Be it so (*Enthusiastus*) as you say yet I vrge the testimonies of the Protestants to this end; to wit, that whereas you rely (perhaps ouermuch) vpon the authority of other Protestants our Aduersaries in this controuersy, that you may see heerby, that other Protestants of eminency do with as strong a ben of iudgement defend the doctrine of *Free will*, as yours do impugne it. And therefore though I seeke not, that the Protestãts by me alledged should ouerballance other Aduersary Protestants heerin, yet I see no reason why they should not equally ballãce with the said Protestants. And thus it followeth, that the matter in respect of this point is become euen and indifferent; as being neither much aduantaged, or much preiudiced by yours or my producing of Protestants, eyther for the impugning, or defending of the doctrine of *Free will*.

Yet heere I must aduertise you of one thing to be considered: It is this. That seeing the former Protestants by me alledged, do compart almost with all

ll other Protestants in all Articles of rotestancy (this only of *Free will*, and ther points therof depending, excepted) it can hardly be coniectured, that he sayd Protestants would diuide thēelues in doctrine from all their other earned Brethren; were it not, that the weight of diuine and humane Authorities did ouersway their iudgmēts therein; seeing otherwise they might hould it as no small scarre to them, being fewer in number, to dispart themselues (but vpon most weighty and forcing Reasons) in iudgment from all other Protestants.

Againe, we know, that Protestāts and *Papists* are Aduersaries one to another in matters of Religion: now, the former alledged *Protestants* by me, do conspire partly in doctrine touching *Free will* with the *Papists*; so as the Authorities of the sayd *Protestants* heerin are to be reputed as Confessions of the aduersary. Now how forcible this kind of Argument drawne from the Confession of an Aduersary is, appeares fro the iudgement of the most learned *D. Whitakers* thus writing of this poynt: (o) *Efficax est Aduersariorum ipsorum testimonium*

(o) D. Whit. contra Bell. l. de Eccles. controuer. 2. q. 3. c. 14.

stimonium &c. The testimony drawne from the Aduersaries, is moct efficacious: and I ingenuously confesse, that Truth is able to extort testimony from its Enemies: the sayd Doctour borrowing his sentence heerin from *Irenaeus* (to omit other Fathers) thus writing: (p) *It is an vnanswerable proofe, which bringeth attestation from the Aduersaries themselues.* But inough of this poynt: and now leauing to insist further in the Protestants iudgments herein, I will ascend vp to those tymes of the Primitiue Church (she being then Christs intemerate, and incontaminate Spouse,) and see of what iudgment the Doctors and Fathers of those purer dayes were, touching *Free will.*

(p) L. 4. c. 14.

Enthusiastus.

I pray you (*Arminius*) rise vp to those times, for I freely confes, that the authorities of those ancient Doctours (so long as they do not impugne Gods Holy Word, and Scripture) ought to haue no small soueraignty ouer mans iudgment. And the rather, seeing we fynd it thus written by our owne men: (q) *We doubt not, but that the Primitiue Church receaued from the Apostles, and Apostoli-*

(q) Kemnitius in exam. Concil. Trident. part. 1. pag. 74.

postolicall men, not only the text of the Scripture, but also the right and native sense thereof. Therefore (*Arminius*) you may proceed.

Arminius.

Now to beginne with those Centinels of Christs Church. Though all of them (I meane both of the Latin and Greeke Church) be most luxuriant and ryotous (as I may say) in their testimonies for the prooving of *Free will*; yet because I will not cloy this presence with a fastidious abundance of such their Authorities, some few (and those pertinent) shall serue. And first I fynd, that *Austin* thus writeth: (r) *It is in our power to consent to Gods calling, or to dissent from it.* Againe, he further thus enlargeth himselfe, euen deliuering our doctrine in these expresse wordes: (s) *I haue dealt with yours, and our Brethren, what I could, that they would persеuere in the sound Catholike fayth, which neither denieth Free will, whether to bad life, or to good; neither attributeth so much vnto it, as that without grace it auayleth any thing.*

And to omit other infinite lyke sayings, he thus plainly teacheth: (t) *Con-*

(r) Tom. 3. de Spir. & litera. c. 34.

(s) Austin. tom. 2. epist. 47. Valentino.

(t) Aust. l. de spirit. & lit. c. 34.

sentire vocationi Dei, vel ab illo dissentire propriæ voluntatis est. It is peculiar to the will, either to giue assent to the calling of God, or to reiect it. But to proceed to others: *Ierome* thus punctually writeth (u) *Hoc est, quod tibi in principio dixeram &c. This is that, which I spake to thee in the beginning: to wit, That it is in our power to sinne, or not to sinne, that so we may keepe the freedome of our will.*

(u) *Hieronimus Dial. contra Pelagianos.*

Epiphanius accordeth to the former Fathers in these words. (x) *Manifestum, euidens, & indubium est, vnicuique liberum arbitrium concessum esse à Deo &c. It is manifest, euident, and indubious, that God hath giuen Freewill to euery man: who hath sayd by himselfe; si volueritis, & si nolueritis; that so by these his wordes, it may be in mans power, eyther to worke well, or to worke badly.*

(x) *Epiphan. Hæres. 16.*

But to contract this poynt. Some Protestants of the greatest Note and ranke, do most fully charge the Fathers in generall with the doctrine of *Freewill*. For thus *D. Whitgift* (that learned Protestant) confesseth of this point: (y) *Almost all the Bishops of the Greeke Church, and Latin also, for the most part, were spotted with the doctrine of Freewill &c.* And

(y) D. Whitg. in his defence of the Answere to the Admonition pag. 472. & 473.

accor-

according to this Doctors iudgment, we fynd that our *Centuriists* (z) do particularly charge, and reprehend these Fathers following, for their maintenance of *Freewill*; to wit, *Iustin*, *Irenæus*, *Cyprian*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Chrysostome*, *Theodoret*, *Cyrill Alexandrinus*, *Prudentius*, *Ambrose*, *Hilary*, *Epiphanius*, *Gregory Nissene*, *and Gregory Nazianzen*. And that three of these ancient Fathers, to wit, *Origen*, *Tertullian*, and *Cyprian* defended the doctrine of *Freewill*, appeareth most euidently from this one consideration.

(z) See *Cent. 2. c. 10. col. 121. & Cent. 3. c. 10. Col. 264. & 240. Cent. 4 Col. 1113. & 1144. & 1181. Cent. 5. Col. 969. &c.*

It is granted by the most learned Aduersaries, that *Austin*, *Epiphanius*, and *Ierome* (in regard of their most cleare sentences in that behalfe) did iointly teach *Freewill*: Well, (a) These Fathers did charge the former three Fathers with these three peculiar Errours following, and no other: to wit; *Cyprian*, with *Rebaptization*, *Tertullian*, with denying *second Mariages*, and *Origen*, with believing that the *Diuels should in the end be saued*.

(a) Austin against Origen *in hæres. 414* Against *Tertull. in hæres. 86.* Against *Cypr. in tom 3. de Baptism. l. 2. c. 7. Ierom. l. contr. Iouin. & Vigil. Epiph. in Hæresibus*.

But now it is more then certaine, that if *Cyprian*, *Origen*, and *Tertullian* had believed, and taught otherwise touching

ching the doctrine of *Freewill* then the ſaid later Fathers did, no doubt they had beene written againſt for this their diſagreement from *Auſtin*, *Ierome*, and *Epiphanius*, touching *Freewill*, as they were charged by them for their former acknowledged Errours. But we do not fynd, that the former three more ancient Fathers were contradicted by the three later, touching the doctrine of *Freewill*: from which point it ineuitably followeth, that *Cyprian*, *Origen*, and *Tertullian* did vnanimouſly agree in defence of *Freewill* with *Auſtin*, *Ierome*, and *Epiphanius*.

And thus far touching the Authorities of the Fathers in this queſtion of *Freewill*; aſſuring you (*Enthuſ.*) and this *worthy Preſence*, that I haue not diſcerped the twentith part of thoſe Teſtimonies, which their Writings and Volumes do affoard of this Subiect.

Enthuſiaſtus.

Learned *Arminius* (for ſo I fynd you to be,) I will not be of that *Ariſtarchian*, and Cenſuring diſpoſition, as to recall the Authorities of thoſe Ancient Fathers to be tryed by the touch

ſtone

stone of my owne iudgment: I reuerence their Authority, both for their learning, vertues, and their proximity to our Sauiours dayes. Only, I euer say, I reuerence them with this presumed caution; to wit, whiles they write concordantly to the Holy Scriptures. And therefore (*Arminius*) if so you can be able to produce out of Gods Holy Writ, as euident Testimonies, (which I yet thinke you cannot) for the fortifying of the doctrine of *Free will*, as your haue already done out of the Fathers writings, I cõfesse, it may perhaps beget in me a certaine hesitation and doubtfulnes of iudgment herein. But (*Arminius*) proceed in that kind of Methode, as shall best seeme pleasing to your selfe; and God I trust (for refractory I will not be) will second the euent.

Arminius.

I will, in fitting tyme arriue to my proofes borrowed from the diuine Scriptures, yet because I wil not ascend thereto (in regard of my prescribed Methode) ouer steepily, or *per saltum*; therefore I will take in my way the *Ancient Iewes* into my consideration;

and will see, whether they stand affected to the doctrine of believing of *Free-will*, or wholy disclaime from the same. But this difficulty is easily dissolued: For doe we not fynd *Rabby Moyses filius Maymon*, thus to instruct his Proselytes? (b) *Ac illud quidem intelligere debetis &c.* But this chiefe and principall foundation of our Law you ought to vnderstand, that both I, and all Philosophers do confesse, That what actions are committed by men, the same to be in their owne power &c. So a man serueth God, if so man himselfe will &c. And if he hath a desire to ioyne himselfe with the wicked &c. he also doth the same.

(b) Epist. aduersus Astrologos.

See further of this point *Rabby Hadarsan* vpon the fourth Chapter of Genesis. And *Rabby Selemo*, alleadged by (c) *Petrus Galatinus. Philo* (that learned Iew) thus initiateth his Reader in this mistery: (d) *Man hath Freewill: God created him free, that being left to his proper will, he might doe whatsoeuer he pleased &c. To which sentence is extant that Oracle in Deuteronomy: Behould I haue placed before thee life and death, good and euill, choose life.* Thus *Philo*. To conclude, That the Ancient *Iewes* were Patrones

(c) In lib. de Arcanis Catholicæ veritatis. Printed at Franckfurd. 1602. l. 6. c. 6.

(d) Philo. lib. quod Deus sit immutabilis.

of

of *Freewill* (so euident and confessed is this point) diuers of our learned Brethren do acknowledge. For *D. Fulk* thus fully speaketh hereof: (e) *The Iewish Rabbins, Patrones of Freewill, do erre.* The like is acknowledged by (f) *Paulus Fagius* (the Protestant,) and by the Booke intituled: (g) *Synagoga Iudaica.*

(e) In his defence of the English Translation. *pag.* 320.

(f) Vpon the words of *Rabbi Akiba.*

(g) Printed *Hannouiæ.* 1604. *pag.* 617.

Enthusiastus.

The Iudgments of the *Iewes* by you alleadged, I cānot very much esteeme, and this for two Reasons. First because you knowe, that vpon the comming of our Sauiour their Law and Religion was to be abrogated and disanulled, as we see by the cessation of their Sacrifices, and diuers other their Ceremonies then vsed. Secondly, some doubt, that that *Galatinus*, whom aboue you mention (being but a late writer) forged in his alleaged Booke certayne sentences, sorting to his owne Religion, and then with subtilty obtruded them, or rather incorporated them in the former *Iewes.* And therefore granting this for true, *D. Whitakers* with more probability might answere his Aduersary producing the Testimonies of the *Iewes*, out

of this *Galatinus* in theſe wordes: (h) *Tuum in hac cauſa Petrum Galatinum minime profecto deſidero, nec Hebræorum Teſtimonijs illis indigemus.* But I pray you leauing theſe Authorities haſten to the Holy Scriptures.

(h) L. 9. contra Duræum, p. 818.

Arminius.

Before I aſcend to Scripturall proofes, you muſt giue me leaue, to eneruate and weaken this your Anſwere. And to the firſt part thereof I reply; That thoſe onely points of fayth are now abrogated, which did prefigure our Sauiours comming; ſuch were the *Ieuiſh* Sacrifices & diuers of their Ceremonies. But now the doctrine of *Free will* beares no reference to our Sauiours Incarnation; ſince once graunting, that man hath *Free will*, certaine it is, that he hath it from his firſt Creation.

Agayne, if the *Ieuiſh* Law doth nothing belong to vs, now after the comming of the *Meſsias*; then it would follow, that the *Ten Comandements* do not belong to vs Chriſtians, & cõſequently that we Chriſtians (as being diſobliged frõ them) may breake the ſame (by worſhipping many Gods, by cõmitting Adultery,

dultery, Theft) with all Impunity and without feare. And thē withal it would follow, that our Sauiour, who first became incarnated, (so humbling himselfe in our base nature) and after suffered most opprobrious death for the expiating of Mans Sinne, should be a meanes throgh which we might with more freedome sinne; thus the Sonne should become to vs a sufficient warrāt for the breach of the Fathers Commādements; The grosse absurdity of which most necessary Inference to weigh, (*Enthusiastus*) I referre to your selfe & this company.

Now to come to the second part of your reply touching *Galatinus*: I am partly perswaded, (though stiffe and peremptory therein I will not be) that the Sentences by him produced for cōfirmation of Christian Religion from the Ancient Iewes, were not by him first forged, and after fathered vpon the *Iewes*. My motiue heerto is this: I fynd, that one *Hieronymus de sancta fide*, who was a *Iew*, but after conuerted to Christianity, & was Physitian to Pope *Benedict* the thirteenth (which *Benedict* was a good tyme before the dayes of

this *Galatinus*) did compose a booke, bearing the Title of *Hebræo-mastix*, or, *vindex impietatis, ac perfidiæ Iudaicæ*; in which booke he laboureth to proue diuers poynts of Christian Religion from the there alledged Authorities & Testimonies of the layd *Iewes* mentioned by *Galatinus*.

This Booke of the forsayd *Hieronymus de Sancta fide*, was but lately printed at *Franckford*, *anno* 1602. But inough of this *Galatinus*, and of the former *Iewes* Authorities. And now in this last place I will arriue vp to the Holy Scriptures.

Enthusiastus.

Arminius, I would gladly intreate you thereto. And as touching all your former proofes for the maintayning of *Freewill*, drawne (as you say) from force of Reason and humane Authorities, I do freely grant, they partly sway with me, and haue made a deeper impression in my iudgement, then at the beginning of our dispute, I euer expected they would. But if the Diuine Authorities hereafter to be alleadged by you, for the fortifying of the said dogmati-

call

call point of *Freewill*, be as punctuall (without any detortion, or wresting of the said Sacred passages) for the proofe of *Freewill*, as the former Authorities haue beene; God only (who searcheth the hart of man) knoweth of what vnexpected force this our disputation may be. Therfore delay no time, but presently hasten thereto.

Arminius.

I am prepared thereto, and now I begin. And that these diuine Testimonies may seize vpon your iudgement more strongly, and this with the lesse reluctation or repugnancy; I will therefore marshall, and range most of the said sacred Authorities vnder certaine *Classes* or Heads; that so you may perceaue, how euery branch of the said passages of Scripture prooue (though by different meanes and respects) the point here intended; I meane, the truth of the Doctrine of *Freewill*.

And first, I will incampe togeather diuers such chiefe texts of Holy Scriptures, which do plainly affirme, that it is in mans power, either to practise Vertue, or vice: which point immediatly

mediatly proueth *Freewill*. Of this kind may be alleaged, (i) *Because they obeyed not thy voyce, nor walked in thy Law, therefore thou hast caused this plague to come vpon them.* Againe: (k) *Iudge I pray you, betweene me and my vineyard; what could I haue done to it, that I haue not done? Why haue I looked, that it should bring foorth grapes, and it hath brought foorth thornes?* And more: (l) *How often would I haue gathered thy children together &c. and thou wouldst not?* (m) *You haue alwayes resisted the Holy Ghost.* (n) *I spread out all the day my hands vnto a people, that gainsaid me.* And in regard of Gods such proceeding, he is said (o) *to stand and knocke at the doore of our Hart.* These Texts afford this Inference: That touching man, who sinneth, either it is in his power not to sinne, ors els he cannot but sinne. Yf it be in his power to forbeare sinning, then hath he *Freewill*: Yf he cannot but of necessity must sinne, then God doth in vaine complayne of man for sinning; seeing it is not in his power not to sinne.

(i) Ier. 32.
(k) Isa. 5.
(l) Math. 23.
(m) Act. 7.
(n) Esa. 65.
(o) Apoc. 3.

Enthusiastus.

To this it seemes, it may be answered,

red, That God (*) doth not vndeseruedly complaine of man, although he cannot but worke euill; seeing men are become thus infirme through their owne fault, and their Hereditary malice. Agayne, a second Reason may be giuen, why God reprehendeth and admonisheth Sinners, to wit, that thereby they may haue a greater auersion, and abhorring of their Sinne.

(*) So answereth Calvin *Instit. l. 2. c. 3.*

Arminius.

These Answeres rather fortify our alleadging of the former Texts, then weaken it: (So the poore byrd by strugling to get out of the net, doth more thereby intangle herselfe therein.) For first I say, to your first point, touching the Hereditary malice insisted vpon by you; We iustify this malice, to be a punishment, but not a fault, contrary to the iudgment of diuers of our Aduersaries in this Controuersy. To the second part of your Answere I reply; That your words include the Doctrine of *Freewill*. For if Sinners through obiurgation and fynding fault with their Sinnes, can be brought to haue a detestation of them, and alter therby their course

course of life, then followeth it, that Sinners haue *Freewill*, which is the point, we vndertake to proue at this present. And if these diuine Corrections cannot cause Sinners to forsake their sinfull course, to what end then doth God vse these speeches, as though it were in our power to sin, or not to sinne?

2. But speaking no further of this point. I will passe on forward to my second *Classe* of Testimonies, which shal containe, That man is commaded therby to doe something, or to forbeare the doing of something. Of this nature are the *Ten Commandements of God*; as, *Thou shalt not haue other Gods then me. Thou shalt not take the name of thy God in vayne. Honour thy Father and thy Mother.* Besides infinite other precepts commanded and imposed vpon vs in Holy Scripture. Now I will draw from these passages this Argument. These holy passages containe a command or rule of liuing well; but God (who worketh nothing in vaine) should idly and fruitlesly impose this rule or command of liuing vertuously, if man wanted *Freewill* to obey or disobey such his Commaũd.

Enthu-

Enthusiastus.

These places I must confesse, seeme very pressing; yet I answere thereto, That the * Law is not giuen in vayne, (and consequently that God worketh not heere to no end) though man wanteth *Free will*, because the Law is giuen not only to be a rule of liuing well, but that by meanes of the Law *Sinne may be knowne*, as the (r) *Apostle* wryteth to the *Romanes*. Agayne, those former Texts do not imply, that God euer secondeth man with his grace, (without which man cannot do any thing well) & therfore they force not so fully (as you may suppose) the poynt heere controuerted.

(*) So Calu. vbi supra.

(r) Rom. 3.

Arminius.

I will first take away the later part of your Answere; for I heere say, that we reade, That (s) *God suffereth not vs to be tempted aboue that, which we are able; but maketh with the temptation a way to escape, that we may be able to sustayne*. And vpon this ground it is, that God himselfe protesteth our possibility of keeping his Commaundements in these words: (t) *The Commandement, which*

(s) 1. Cor. 10.

(t) Deuter. 30. *I haue giuen thee this day &c. is very neere to thee, euen in thy mouth, and hart, that thou maist do it.* Which words (as some of our Aduersaries pretend) cannot be vnderstood of the *knowledge of the Law*, & not of mans power to keep it; since this exposition contradicteth the wordes of the Text, which speaketh expressely of *doing*, euen according to the iudgment of other more moderate (u) Protestats. Now what can be more cleare for conuincing that man hath *Freewill*, & that God is not wanting to assist him with his Grace; then the former words, being the Conclusion it selfe?

(u) Hiperius l. 2. Methodi Theolog. & p. 479. 480.

To the first part of your Answere I reply, that granting the Law may haue seuerall ends; certaine it is, that one end thereof (& that the principall) is to be a rule to man, for practising of Vertue and auoyding of Vice: but then in respect of this end, it must vnauoydably follow, that man hath freedome of will giuen him by God, either to violate the Law, or through Gods Grace (seconding his endeauour) to keep it. Againe admit, that beside the former end, the Law be giuen, that thereby Sinne may be knowne; then I say, this

is

is but concident with the first end: for to what other end should Sin be known but that by knowing it, mā may auoid it? and how can it be auoyded, except man hath *Freewill*, eyther to sinne, or not to sinne?

Euthusiastus.

I pray you *Arminius*, proceed to other kinds of Scripturall Authoritys. And I like well your reducing them to certaine Heads: since this kind of Methode doth much facilitate our apprehending & better conceauing of them.

Arminius.

My next Head then shall contayne some few passages of Gods Holy word, by the which something is vnder condition promised vnto vs by God, if so our selues will. Now, from these Authorities I thus dispute. Eyther it is in our power to performe the Condition imposed, or it is not in our power: If it be in our power, then haue we Freewill: If it be not in our power, then is not that any true Promise vnder the condition annexed, but only an euidēt deluding and deriding of the party, to

whome ſuch an idle promiſe is made. Were it not ridiculous to inuite a man vnder promiſe of a great reward to run ſuch a number of myles within a preſcribed tyme; & yet during all the time preſcribed, to enchaine and ſhackle the legs of the party, who ſhould run, as that he could not mooue them? The like exorbitancy of proceeding is found in our former ſuppoſall.

Now (among others) the Texts of this Nature are theſe following: (a) *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandements.* Agayne: (b) *Seeke good, and not euill, and you ſhall liue.* And further: (c) *If you conſent and obey, you ſhall eate the good things of the land; but if you refuſe or will not, you ſhall be deuoured with the ſword.*

(a) *Mat.* 19.

(b) *Amos* 5.

(c) *Iſa.* 1.

Enthuſiaſtus.

I haue read ſome of Note, who haue laboured to auoyde theſe former places, by maintayning, that it is not abſurd, (*) That God ſhould promiſe to man vnder an impoſſible Condition: To men (ſay they) that are wicked, that by theſe kinds of Promiſes, it may appeare to them, how vnworthy they are of Gods benignity and goodnes; To the

(*) So Calu. *ibi ſupra.*

the Vertuous & good men, such promises may be made by God, that through the sweetnes of the Promises, the Vertuous may be more allured to walke in the precepts of God.

Arminius.

This Answere (vnder your fauour) is wholy impertinent; since the question here is not, why God doth proffer his promises to good men, or euill men: but I auer, that from the former Text it is proued (which is the point only controuerted) that nothing can be rightly promised vnder Condition, but to that Creature, which hath freedome of Will, since otherwise (let the reason of the promise be what it will) the proffer of such a Condition would be expounded rather an Ironicall scoffing, then any true and reall Conditionall promise. Agayne, this Conditionall Promise to the Good & Vertuous, cannot be vnderstood Ironically, but really and truly: And therefore it is in the power of the Vertuous, either to performe, or not to performe the imposed Condition; since that is peculiar to a true Condition, to wit, that it may de-

pend vpon the Freedome of his will, to whom it is made.

But I will proceed to my next Head of Authorities, & these shall contayne,

4. that God offereth to man a *Choyce* of seuerall thinges, from whence we necessarily gather, that it is in mans power to chuse, either of those different thinges, propounded to him to be chosen. For we hould it both absurd and ridiculous to giue in words an election and choyce of different thinges, and yet (by forcibly restrayning him but to one thing) to take away all power of his choyce & freedome to any other thing. According to this aboue said, these few Texts (among many others) present themselues to vs: (d) *I call Heauen and Earth to witnesse this day against you, that I haue set before you life, and death &c. Choose therefore life.* And according to this his proposed Choyce of life, and death, God thus sweetly complayneth of *Israel:* (e) *Why wilt thou dye, O house of Israel?* A second place may be that: (f) *Choyce is giuen to you, whom you will serue.* In which words *Iosue* implieth, that it was in the Peoples power, either to serue the true God, or the Idols.

(d) Deuter. 30.

(e) Ezech. 18.

(f) Iosue 24.

Other

Other passages of this Nature the Booke of *Ecclesiasticus* doth affoard, which though it be not accepted by vs for Canonicall Scripture, yet *M. Perkins* thus worthily speaketh of it, to wit, *That he preferreth this Booke* (g) *before any other Bookes of men.* Thus then we read in that Booke: (h) *He hath set water and fyre before thee, stretch out thy hand to which thou wilt.* And agayne: (i) *Before man it lyfe and death, good and euill; what lyketh him, shall be giuen him.* And lastly: (k) *Who might offend, and hath not offended, or do euill, and hath not done it.* Then which what can be more euident for proofe of *Free will?*

(g) In his reformed Catholike pag. 134.
(h) Eccles. 15.
(i) Ibid.
(k) c. 31.

Thus far of the chiefe Authorities; which may be reduced to certaine generall Heads (this next *Classe* following excepted.) From whence we are instructed; *First*, that God plainly sayth, it is in mans power either to practise vertue or vice. *Secondly*, that God commandeth to do something, or to forbeare the doing of something. *Thirdly*, that God promiseth to vs something vpon some condition, if so we will our selues. *Fourthly*, that God giueth election and choyce to man to chooſe one thing

before another thing: All which foure points potentially include freedome of Will in man, as is aboue demonstrated.

To these former we may adioine this one other Head, contayning such places of Scripture, in which men are tearmed *Workers, Builders, Planters, Coadiutors with God in the Work of their Saluation.* The places are these: (l) *Call the workemen, and giue them &c.* (m) *I haue planted, Apollo hath watered, but God gaue the increase.* And againe, in the same place we reade: *Euery one shall receaue his wages according to his labour, for we are the Coadiutors of God.*

Now, if men do properly worke nothing by their *Free will*, but only are led and moued by God in these kind of actions, as meere *instruments*; then they ought not to be called *Co-workers*, or *Coadiutors of God*, no more then a pen can be called a *Co-wryter*, or a knyfe a *Co-cutter*, or any other *dead instrument* to be so accordingly called, in respect of its vse, to which it is appropriated.

But now leauing these former generall Branches, I will close vp your iudgment with one most choaking Testimony, euery word almost thereof a

foarding

foarding an argument in proofe of *Freewill*: The place is this: (n) *The Lord said to Cain, Why art thou angry? or why is thy Countenance cast downe? If thou dost well, shalt thou not be rewarded? Si autem male, statim in foribus peccatum aderit: sed sub te erit appetitus eius, & tu dominaberis illius. If euill, Sinne lyeth at the doore: but vnder thee the desire of it shall be, and thou shalt haue rule ouer it.* Now let vs (as it were) dissect this one Testimony. And first: *Why art thou angry, or why is thy Countenance cast downe?* This Interrogation euidently sheweth, that it was in the power of *Cain* (if so himselfe would) not to become angry, or to be sorrowfull. For why is it not said to a new borne Infant, why dost thou crye, but because we do know, it is not in the Infants power to crye, or not to crye? Or why say we not to a Dog, why dost thou barke; or to a Lyon, why dost thou roare; but because it is manifest, that it is not in the power of these beasts to barke, and not to barke, to roare and not to roare?

(n) Genes. 4.

To come to the next wordes: *If thou dost well, shalt thou not be rewarded? If euill, Sinne lyeth at the doore &c.* Now

this addition (*if well, if euill*) doe euidently imply *Free-will*. For why do we not say to man, If thou wilt make the Sunne to stand still (as we vsually say to man, if thou wilt do well) thou shalt haue this, or that thing giuen to thee for making the Sunne to stand still, but because we know, that it is not in mans power, to stay the course of the Sunne, but that it is in his power to doe well, if he will, or euill, if he will not?

Now to come to the last passage of this Text: *If euill, Sinne lyeth at the doore: but vnder thee, the desire of it shall be, and thou shalt haue rule ouer it.* These words most plumbe and perpendicularly (as I may say) fall vpon the proofe of *Free-will*. For what other meaning of them can be, then that the desire of Sinne shalbe in thy power, *and thou shalt haue rule ouer it*, that is, it is in thy power (if thou wilt) to resist Sinne? I well know, that some of our Brethren, (*) who are aduerse to vs in the doctrine of *Free-will*, rather by way of declining, then answering this difficulty, affirme, that *Cain* had rule, not ouer it, viz. *Sinne*, but ouer him, vz. *Abel*. And so accordingly they doe translate this Text in some of

(*) See the marginall notes of the English Bibles of the yeare 1576 vpon this place.

of their Bibles.

How forced (and indeed how absurd) this Constructiō is, I will prooue (because this Text is most cōuincing.) *First* from the contexture of the words thēselues: *Secondly*, from the exposition of this place, giuen by the Auncient Fathers, whose exposition thereof is coincident with this our exposition: *Thirdly* from the like Construction of the ancient Rabbins passed vpon this passage: And *lastly* from the like Construction giuen thereof by diuers of our owne learned Brethren; vpon the Authority of which place, they greatly stay themselues for the proofe of *Free-will*. 1. 2. 3. 4.

And first to examine the wordes themselues, I maintayne, that according to all true Grammaticall Construction, the two *Relatiues* (*eius*, and *illius*) must be necessarily referred to the *Antecedent* next going before; but the next precedent *Antecedent* is, *Sinne*, and not *Abel*. Secondly, I affirme for the more conuincing of this point, that *Abel* is not so much as once named in this passage: how then can the *Relatiues*, *eius*, and *illius*, be referred to *Abel*,

as to their *Antecedent*?

Thirdly, this will prooue more euident, if we doe obserue the coherency of the sense giuen by vs, with the words. For to say, *Sin lyeth at the doore, and thou shalt haue rule ouer it*, the sense is heer most playne, and expedite: but to say, *Sinne lyeth at the doore, vz.* to torment thy cõscience, *and thou shalt haue rule ouer him (vz.* ouer *Abel* thy Brother) is most forced, harsh, and constrayned; & with an ordinary & regular reference to the words in the Text, most dissolute and inconsequent.

But to descend to the interpretation of the Fathers touching this place. *Gregory* thus writeth: (o) *Diuina voce Cain &c. It is sayd by the voyce of God to Cain, being of a wicked dispositiõ; Sinne lyeth at the doore, but vnder thee shall the desire of it be, and thou shalt haue rule ouer it.* *Ierome* in alluding to the words of the Text, thus writeth: (p) *quia liberi arbitrij es &c. Because thou hast Free will, therefore I counsell thee (vt non tibi peccatum, sed tu peccato domineris) that Sinne may not haue rule ouer thee, but that thou may rule ouer Sinne.* Finally to omit the like Constructiõ giuen by diuers other

(o) *Moral. l. 4. c. 22.*

(p) *In quæstionib. Hebraicis.*

her (q) Fathers: *Austin* thus literally expoundeth the former wordes: (r) *Tu dominaberis illius, numquid fratris? absit. Cuius igitur, nisi peccati? thou shalt rule ouer it, what, ouer thy brother? not so: ouer what then but Sinne?* So conspiringly this Father agrees with our Interpretation heerein.

(q) *Prosper. l. de vocat. Gentium, c. 23. Ambros. l. 2. de Cain. c. 7. Beda in hunc locum Genes. 4.*

To come to the ancient Rabins. (s) *Aben Ersa* affirmeth *it to be a meer forgery, to referre the Relatiue in the former Text to any other thing, then to the word Sinne. Rabby Moyses Hadarsan* sayth: (t) *quod scriptum est; Ad te concupiscentia peccati, & tu dominaberis illius: Hoc est, si volueris, prævalebis aduersus illud. That is, where it is written; the desire of Sinne shalbe to thee, and thou shalt rule ouer it: The meaning heerof is, that if thou wilt, thou shalt preuayle ouer it.* Thus Rabby *Hadarsan*. To be briefe, the auncient Iewes are so plaine in expoũding the former passage in proofe of *Freewill*, that *D. Fulke* taketh notice therof, and thus answereth them: (u) *The Iewish Rabbins erre in this place.*

(r) *Austin. l. 15. de Ciuitat. Dei c. 7.*

(s) In his Hebrew Commentaries vpon *Genesis, c. 4.*

(t) *In ca. 4. Genes.*

(u) In the English Translat. pa. 320.

To come lastly to our owne Brethren: Their iudgments are here made manifest, partly by their wrytings, and partly

partly by their like agreeable Transla-
tion of this very Text in their version
of their Bibles. Touching their owne
Authorities herein, I will (for greater
expedition) only cite the places of such
their writings. See then (x) *Hyperius*, (y)
Wigandus (both no obscure Protestants)
and euen (z) *Luther* himselfe. As con-
cerning their Publike Translations of
the Bible, answerable thereto, see the
great English Bible of anno 1584. and
see the Annotations annexed thereto,
all shewing, that it is (*Sinne*) and not
Abel, ouer which *Cain* shall haue rule.
The same appareth from the Transla-
tion of the Bible by *Castalio*, printed at
Basill, anno 1573. which Translation is
much commended by (a) *D. Humfrey*.

(x) *In l. 2. Method. Theolog. p. 478.*
(y) *In Syntagm. ex veteri Testam. Colum. 489.*
(z) *Tom. 2. Vvitemberg. ann. 1580. fol. 62.*
(a) *De rat. Interpret. l. 2. p. 62. & 63.*

And thus far for the more full vn-
foulding and explicating of this most
markable, cleare, and illustrious passage
of *Genesis*, for the confirmation of our
Doctrine of *Freewill*. And heere now I
make my pause, being in good hope,
that all the former Authorities both
diuine and humane, (produced by me
since the beginning of our dispute) will
winne some ground vpon your Iudg-
ment (*Enthusiastus*) for your giuing as-
sent

ſent to our moſt true, ancient, and Apoſtolicall doctrine herein.

Enthuſiaſtus.

I do freely grant, my iudgment is ouerborne with the ſtreame of your moſt forcing Authorities; and the rather, ſince I muſt confeſſe, I was much miſtaken in the alleadging of my proofes for the impugning of *Freewill:* ſeeing through your auoiding of them, now vpon a ſecond, and more retired view I well diſcerne, how they did rather but idly beate the wynd through my owne miſapplyed detortiō of them, then otherwiſe leuell at the intended marke; So illuſtrious a truth (now I confeſſe) is the doctrine of *Freewill*, as that the greateſt doubt, which thereof I ſhall hereafter perhaps make, is only, whether I can haue *Freewill* at any time hereafter, to deny the doctrine of *Freewill?*

But (*learned Arminius*) though I doe much incline to belieue, that man hath *Freewill*; yet there are certaine other dogmaticall points, in which I confeſſe, as yet, I do diſſent from you. And among the reſt, theſe two following:

ing: To wit, the first, *The doctrine of Reprobation*, by which *I believe, That God hath decreed some men euen from their mothers wombe, without any preuision of their workes to eternall damnation.* The second, *The Infallible Certainty of a mans owne Election, or Predestination*; in both which points many learned Deuines of our owne Country borrowing their doctrines from you, do (I grant) hold the contrary. Now I would see (*Arminius*) if you be as fully furnished with sufficient Answeres to what I shall obiect therein, as also with good proofes for the fortifying of your contrary Tenets heerein, as you haue discouered your selfe to be, for the Doctrine of *Freewill.*

Arminius.

Glad I am to heare (*Enthusiastus*) the hopefull euēt of this our discourse, and in you I see that sentence verifyed: (b) *Iustificata est sapientia à filijs suis.* And as touching the other points of doctrine mentioned by you (wherein you and your party mainly differ from me) you may take notice, that our beliefe of them is necessarily, and implicitly included

(b) *Math.* 11.

cluded (so the Cause includes in it selfe the Effect) in the doctrine of *Freewil*. For once granting the Doctrine of *Freewill* to be consonant to the Scriptures, then it vnauoydably and most consequently followeth, that euery man may be saued through the force of his *Freewill*, cooperating with Gods Grace & mercy: as also it followeth, from the Doctrine of *Freewill*, that man enioyeth not *an Infallibility of his Election*; seeing as enioying *Freewill*, it is in his power, of Vertuous to become wicked, & consequently to loose the benefite of *Election*. Neuertheles seeing the reducing the warrant of the sayd two doctrines to the doctrine of *Freewill*, is ouer generall and large; therefore beginne at your pleasure (*Enthusiastus*) to impugne the sayd doctrines, & I shall shape particuler answeres to your particuler Arguments; and that done, then will I vndertake to make good the said doctrines both from diuine and humane Authorities.

Enthusiastus.

I will most willingly (so desirous I am to receaue satisfaction heerin from your

your selfe.) And I will beginne w
the doctrine of the Certainty of Ma
Election, or Predestination, in the profec
ting whereof, I will tread my forme
tract of Methode; to wit, in giuing th
first place to diuine proofes; and the
after I will descend to humane proofe
being of an inferiour weight.

Arminius.

Well Sir, proceede in your own
chosen Methode at your own pleasur
but before you enter into dispute, gi
me leaue (as in the doctrine of *Free w*
aboue I did) to set downe the true sta
of this question, with its due explica
on or restrictiō; seeing by this meanc
we no doubt shall find (as in the for
mer Controuersy we did) that seuera
of your proofes from Scripture will n
receaue their full answere, by recur
ring to the true state of the Question.

Heer then we are to obserue, th
whereas you, and your fellowes d
maintaine, that euery one that is el
cted, is assured infallibly of his own
Election, by his owne *ordinary and speci*
faith, which (say you) is most infalli
ble: Now I, and others comparting
doctri

doctrine with me, do teach as followeth. First that so far forth, as concernes Gods promise touching our *Election*, we say his promise is on his part most certaine and infallible: But yet seeing Gods promise therein is only *conditionall*, implying euer some things to be performed on our part; to wit, the *Conditions* of beliefe, of true repentance, & of finall perseuerance; now the performance by Gods grace, or not performance of these *Conditions*, being in our power, it consequently followeth, that our *Election* to vs is vncertaine. Since God thus pronounceth: (c) *If the iust man do turne away from his righteousnes &c. in his sinne he shall die.* (c) Ezech. 18.

Thus through our owne frailty and indisposition, not answering at all tymes to Gods holy inspirations and grace, our *Election* to vs is euer vncertayne (though, as aboue said, in respect of Gods promise, we fulfilling the annexed Conditions thereto, most certayne) and consequently it followeth, that we cannot be assured of *Saluation* by *fayth*, seeing *fayth* is infallible, but only by *Hope*, which (through our cooperating with Gods grace, and assi-

stance) is not infallibly certaine, nether-theles it is accompanied with great comfort & confidence. Now here once for all you are to conceaue, that diuers sayings of God, either touching *Predestination* or *Reprobation*, though in words they seeme absolute, yet in sense are only *Conditionall*; In proofe of which my assertion I will alleage a place of *Ezechiel* c. 33, which (as a *Comment*) well may seeme to expounde all such seeming absolute Texts of this nature. God Almighty words in *Ezechiel* are these: *When I shall say vnto the righteous, that he shall surely liue; if yet he trusting vnto his owne righteousnes, commit iniquity &c. he shall dye.* Againe. *When I shall say vnto the wicked, thou shalt dye the death: If yet he returne from his sinnes, and do that which is right &c. he shall surely liue.* So clearely doth the Prophet instruct vs, that all such seeming absolute sayings in Scripture, haue euer by implication some *Conditions* annexed thereto. Now this being the true state of this Question, and illustrated with the explication of *Ezechiel*; begin to impugne it from Holy Writ, at your plasure, which you shall neuer be able to doe.

Enthu-

Enthusiastus.

Well then, the first passage of diuine Scripture, which I will alledge, shal be that of the Apostle to the Corinthians: (d) *Try your selues, if you be in the fayth: proue you your selues: know you not your selues, that Christ Iesus is in you, vnles perhaps you be Reprobates?* (d) 2. Corinth. 13.

Arminius.

I answere heerto; first admitting, that this Text did prooue, that *Christ* was in the Corinthians, according to his grace of Iustification; yet the Text proueth that only for the time present; but whether the *Corinthians* might after loose that grace or not, or want finall perseuerance (which is the point heer only questioned) this Text nothing toucheth; and therefore you may see, that granting more touching the exposition of the Text, then I need to doe; yet the Answere is inuolued in the state in the Question aboue set downe. And accordingly heerto, this knowledge of vs being in the fayth (if the wordes were to be interpreted in that sense) is to be restrained only to the tyme pre-

sence: but for our continuance in the fayth, the Text speaketh nothing.

Secondly, I reply, that this knowledge of the *Corinthians*, that *Christ* was in them, hath reference only of *Christ* being in them, by way of (e) *Signes, wonders*, and *mighty deeds*, done among them: which if they did not acknowledge, they were Reprobates. And that this knowledge of Christ being in the, cannot be referred, according to his grace of Iustification, is most cleare; in that *S. Paul* would neuer then haue rebuked and reprehended the *Corinthians* in so full and grieuous a manner, as we find, that in the same (f) Epistle he did. Thus much heerof.

(e) 2. Cor. 6. 12.

(f) Ibid. to. 10.

Enthusiastus.

I take this your answere for sufficient, for I see the Text (if the scope of the Epistle be precisely obserued) precludeth me of al reply: but what say you to this other passage of Scripture, where the Apostle speaketh of himself in this most confident manner: (g) *I know*, (*) *that lyfe nor death &c shall be able to remoue me from that loue, that God beareth to me in Christ.* What greater assured nesse could the Apostle vtter of his saluation then this?

(g) Rom. 8.

(*) Obiected by M. Iewel in his Apology of the Church of England. pa. 78.

Armi-

Arminius.

To this I shape a double answere. First, admitting that these words should be meat of the certainty of knowledge, yet they do not prooue the particuler knowledge, which our aduersaries do pretend, that euery one of the Elect should haue of himselfe only. My reason heerof is: because these words are deliuered by the Apostle, touching his knowledge aswell of others, as himself. For the words are not, *shall be able to remoue me*, but, *shall be able to remoue vs*, the Apostle speaking thus in the person of the *Elect*, and not of himselfe only But touching the saluation of the *Elect*, there is no controuersy betweene vs and our Aduersaries.

Secondly, and more punctually I reply, and affirme, that in the Greeke of the former Text, it is only, *Persuasus sum*, and not *Certus sum*; for the Greeke word vsed by *S. Paul*, is πέπεισμαι, which signifieth in English: *I am perswaded*. And thus the certainty of knowledge, which this Text affordeth, is only of *Persuasion* & *Hope*, but not of *Faith*, or infallible knowledge; which

is the point only here issuable. That the Text signifyeth only, *I am perswaded*, & not, *I am certaine*, is so euident, that the English Bibles printed anno Dom. 1576. and 1590. do read with me in this very place, *I am perswaded*. Yea *Beza* himselfe in his Translation of the New Testament, in this place translateth, (h) *Mihi persuasum est*: So little doth this Text proue for infallibility of Saluation.

(h) Printed at London, anno 1587.

Lastly I may say, that granting S. *Paul* here spake of the certainty of his owne Saluation; yet it may be well answered, that this certainty (in regard of his high fauour with God) he had by reuelation only, and not by force of his *ordinary fayth*, as our Aduersaries do pretend to haue.

Enthusiastus.

(i) 1. Iohn 5.

I will proceed further: (i) *These things I write vnto you, that you may know that you haue eternall life, which beleeue in the name of the Sonne of God.*

Arminius.

To this I answere. First, that by *Eternall life*, may be here vnderstood

know-

knowledge of God, which the faithfull haue, according as we read in *S. Iohns* Ghospell: (k) *This is life everlasting, that they know thee.* Secondly I say, That *True Believers haue eternall life*, not *actually*, (since they do not actually enioy Heauen) but only in *Hope*, according as it is els where said; (l) *We are saued by hope.* For that if we will attayne eternall life actually and indeed, our perseuerance in fayth is necessarily required, of which perseuerance this passage of Scripture intimateth no certainty; since (according to the words of (m) *Exechiel* aboue cited) this Text (as many more) implyes in it a *Condition* to be performed; and consequently, it proueth no certainty or infallibility of mans Election.

(k) C. 17.

(l) Rom. 8.

(m) Ezech. 33.

Enthusiastus.

We thus read, that the Apostle (n) Rom. 8. sayth: (n) *We haue receaued the spirit of Adoption, whereby we cry: Abba Pater. And the spirit it selfe beareth witnes to our spirit, that we are the Sonnes of God; and if his Sonnes, then also heyres, if so be that we suffer with him &c.*

Arminius.

You cloy me (*Enthusiastus*) with a fastidious saciety of Texts of this Nature. For this Text only proueth, that the Iust during the state of their present Iustice, are the Sonnes of God, and consequently his Heyres: But whether the Iust shal perseuere in that state till their death, (which is the chiefe point of this Controuersy) this Text prooueth not. Nay it proueth, that the Iust may fall from their Iustice, and thereupon loose their Election, as is fully insinuated by the Condition annexed in this very Text, vz. *If so that we suffer with him.* Certainly the damned Spirits before their fall were the Sonnes or Children of God, & yet afterward through their want of perseuerance in righteousnes, they fell from their former state. So little doth this Authority prepaile in proofe of the certainty of mans *Predestination* or *Election*, the certainty that is prooued from this passage, being only coniecturall, and not infallible.

Enthu-

Enthusiastus.

What reply you to that of the Apostle: (o) *Whom he called, them also he iustifyed; and whom he iustifyed, them also he glorifyed.* In shew of words a most forcing Authority, since from hence it seemes it may be concluded, that whom God doth iustify, he is thereby one of the *Elect*, and glorifyed, and so cannot finally fall. (o) Rom. 8.

Arminius.

I reply. This your inference were strong, if all, who are called, were *Elect*. But contrary to this we read: (p) *Many are called, but few Elect*; therefore this place can take no more hold of him that is iustifyed, then of him that is called, since the words of the Text haue equall Reference to them both. Therefore the true meaning of this place is vnderstood not of euery one, that is called or iustifyed in generall, but only of the *Elect*, whom God in his foreknowledge (according as it is said in the former alleaged Chapter) *foreknew to be called, according to purpose of election.* And of these it is granted, none doth finally (p) Matth. 22.

nally fall. But who these *Elect* be, no man knoweth: (q) *For who hath known the mynd of the Lord, or who hath beene his Counsellour?*

(q) Rom. 11.

Enthusiastus.

S. Paul thus writeth of himselfe: (r) *I am* (*) *now ready to be crucifyed, and the tyme of my resolution is at hand. I have finished my Course, &c. and there is laid vp for me a Crowne of Iustice, which the Lord will render to me at that day:* So certaine it is, that S. Paul was assured of his Election.

(r) 2. Tim. 4.

(*) Obiected by M. Willet in Synops. pa. 557.

Arminius.

This place toucheth not the difficulty: For *S. Paul* was assured of his Saluation through extraordinary Reuelation. And our Aduersaries (s) do affirme with vs, *that a man may be assured of his Saluation by extraordinary Reuelation, as Abraham, and others were.* But this is not the point controuerted betweene them and vs, seeing our Aduersaries do teach, that this knowledge is by *Ordinary Fayth*, as (t) *M. Perkins* maintaines. Now that *S. Paul* had knowledge of his Saluation only by extraordinary Reue-

(s) M. Perkins in his reformed Catholike. p. 48.

(t) Vbi supra, p. 39.

lation,

tion, appeareth from his like foreknowledge of his owne death, mentioned in this very passage alleaged in those wordes: *The tyme of my resolution is at hand.* And according to his like revelation he said to the Ephesians: (u) *Behold, I know, that you no more shall see my face.*

(u) Act. 20.

Thus we see, by true weighing of this Text, that it affordeth, no greater proofe for our Aduersaries presumed infallibility of their Saluation, then it doth, for the certaine knowledge of the tyme of their death; since the Text concerneth both alike, and therefore either both these points, or neither are prooued from this passage of Scripture.

Enthusiastus.

We are counselled by *S. Peter* to make our calling and election sure by good workes: His words are these: (x) *Wherefore brethren,* (*) *giue rather diligence to make your calling and election sure by good workes; for if you do these thinges, you shall neuer fall.* Now from this it seemes, that the Faythfull are assured of their *Election.*

(x) 2. Petr. 1.

(*) Obiected by *Kimmoontius* in his *Redempt. of mankind.* p. 482.

Armi-

Arminius.

Heere *Enthusiaste*, you haue afforded me a weapon, wherewith to wound your owne Cause, since the force of this your reason recoyleth vpon your selfe. For this Text teacheth vs, that the Certainty of Gods promise touching our Saluation depends vpon our good workes, and therefore is but *Conditionall*; which *Condition* we fynd to be set down in these words: *If so you doe these things*. So cleare is this diuine Authority againſt our Aduersaries pretended certainty by fayth.

Enthusiastus.

We read thus of the *Ephesians*; *That they* * *were* (y) *signed with the holy Spirit of promise, which is the pledge of our inheritance*. And againe it is sayd to the: (z) *Greeue not the spirit, wherby you are signed to the day of Redemption*. Now what other thing do these Texts import, then the Certainty of the *Ephesians* saluatiō?

(*) Obiected by D. Fulke againſt Purgat. p. 33.

(y) Eph. 1.

(z) Eph. 4.

Arminius.

This place only prooueth at the moſt, that by the *signing*, and *pledge*, or *earneſt* of our *inheritance*, is vnderſtood

the

the conuention, or Promise made vpon Gods part to the *Ephesians*; the performance whereof we willingly grant to be on his syde certayne; but the Text telleth vs not, that the *Ephesians* were assured hereby to accomplish and performe the Cõditions requyred on their part; But they rather to the contrary heere are premonished, *not to grieue the Spirit*, and so accordingly it is in other places of Scripture said: (a) *They resisted the holy Spirit*. And againe: (b) *They rebelled and vexed his holy Spirit*.

(a) Act. 7.
(b) Isa. 63.

Enthusiastus.

Well to presse a little further. We read that it is said: (c) *Whom Christ* (*) *loueth, he loueth to the end*. Agayne we read: (d) *That which my Father hath giuen me, is greater then all; and no man can pluck them out of my Fathers hand*. Briefly (to accumulate and heape seuerall Texts togeather) the Apostle teacheth vs, that (e) *the gifts and vocation of God are without repentance*. Now from all these places what other necessary inference can result, then that one being once in state of Grace, shall persevere therein to the end; & consequently, that such an one

(c) Iohn. 13.
(d) Iohn. 10.
(*) By M. Willet in Synops. p. 552.
(e) Rom. 11.

is certaine of his Saluation?

Arminius.

I answere, that this inference is not so much as probable, (so inconsequent it is) much lesse necessary. And to answere in order to the Texts as they are alleaged. True it is, That God for his part, whom he loueth, loueth to the end; & accordingly we read; that (f) *he loued the rich man, who went away from him*; and yet from this loue of our Sauiour to the rich man, we cannot infer, that *the Rich man* was one of the *Elect*. Againe it is most true, that God loueth all men, as they are his Creatures, though he hateth their Sinne; For the wiseman instructeth vs, that (g) *God loueth all thinges, that are, and hateth none of them, whom he hath made.*

(f) Marc. 10.

(g) Sapient. 11.

To the second place I answere, that another like place of our Sauiours words may well seeme to explane this; as where he said: (h) *Those whom thou gauest me, I haue kept, and none of them perished, but the Sonne of perdition.* Now by parallelling these two seuerall Texts togeather it is euident, that the meaning of this place is not, that euery one,

(h) Iohn 17.

whom

whom the Father giueth, perseueres to the end, for then the Son of perdition (to wit *Iudas*) who (as the Text sayth) was *giuen*, should haue perseuered to the end. But rather, that the Diuell by all temptations, cannot perforce pull a man from God, except he giues his voluntary consent to yield to the diuels assaults.

Secondly, suppose these wordes to be vnderstood of the *Elect* in generall, whose finall repentance is knowne to God (of whom we all acknowledge, that *None do perish*) for God is not deceaued in his foreknowledge: yet this inforceth nothing, seeing both the (i) Fathers, and our owne learned (k) Brethren do teach, that *things are not, because God doth foresee them; but God doth foresee therin, because they are.*

To the third Text, I answere: That God indeed doth neuer repent him of his guifts bestowed vpon any man, yet neuertheles by reason, that many do abuse his giftes, applying them otherwise then God intended, he is said in holy Scripture (as speaking to our Capacity) (l) *to repent him.*

(i) *Hier. in c. 26. Hier.* sayth: *Non ex eo, quod Deus scit futurum aliquid, idcirco futurum est: Sed quia futurum est, Deus nouit.* See likewise Austin *tom. 7. de prædest. & gratia, c. 15.*

(k) *Hiperius in Method. Theol. l. 1. pa. 319.* sayth: *Neque quia præscit Deus hominem peccaturum, ideo homo peccat; sed quia peccaturus erat, ideo Deus id*

Enthu-

praesciuit. The like saying hath *Amandus Polanus in partit. Theolog. l. 1 p. 8.*

Enthusiastus.

Well. I will close this point of vrging more Scipturall Authorities (since I see, *Arminius*, you are very dexterous in auoyding of them) with these following, which for greater expedition I will amasse togeather. We fynd the Apostle thus to say: *Christ shall* (n) *confirme you* (speaking to the *Corinthians*) *vnto the end*. In like sort the said Apostle els where thus sayth: (n) *He hath chosen vs before the foundation of the world*. Agayne: (o) *Who shall accuse against the Elect of God?* Finally we read in the Gospell: (p) *No man shall pluck my sheepe out of my hand*. All which authorities may seeme well to fortify the Infallibility of *Predestination*.

(l) *Gen. 2. & 1. Samuel 15.*
(m) *2. Cor. 2.*
(n) *Ephes. 1.*
(o) *Rom. 8.*
(p) *Iohn. 10.*

Arminius.

These Texts, though many in number, yet are small in force, so far as they glance from the intended marke. And as for the two first (to which many others of the same nature may be ranged, taking their answere, from the Answere giuen to these two) the Apostle only meaneth, That he hopeth

well

well of the ſaluation of the *Corinthians*, and *Epheſians*; but that he ſhould be aſſured through a certainty of faith, that all the Corinthians, and all the Epheſians (for the Apoſtle ſpeaketh indefinitely to them all) ſhould be ſaued, is moſt abſurd to thinke. To the two later Authorities. They only teach, that the *Elect* cannot finally perish; but they doe not teach, that the *Elect* do know ſo much of themſelues in particular; or that they are of the nuber of the *Elect*: which poynt remaynes yet vnprooued.

Enthuſiaſtus.

I will deſiſt (as I ſayd afore) from vrging more places of Gods word. For I willingly grant, I haue produced all ſuch Texts, as I thought had been moſt preuayling for the proofe of the doctrine, for which they were vrged. Onely before I leaue the Scene of further oppoſing, I will inſiſt in an Argument or two, drawne from force of reaſon, which Arguments preuayle ſtrongly with diuers men of iudgment: my firſt then ſhall be drawne from the efficacy of *Fayth* and *Hope*. And thus I diſpute. The holy Scripture aſcribeth to

Fayth πληροφορία, or most full assurance in the tenth Chapter to the *Hebrews*. In like sort in the eleauenth Chapter to the Hebrews, it is called in regard of its Infallibility, *Coniunctio* or *Hypostasis*, *a firme ground of things to be hoped for*, or, *an infallible euidence of things we see not*. Agayne in the Epistle of *S. Iames*, cap. 1. *Hesitation* and *wauering* is opposed to *Fayth*. In like sort in the sixt to the Hebrews, *a steedy firmenes* is attributed to *Hope*, onas the former greeke word is, πληροφορία, in which place *Hope*, through its stability and firmenes, is compared to an *Anker*. Therefore in regard of Gods promising a remission of our Sinnes, why should we rest doubtfull thereof?

My second Argument shalbe taken from the seeming absurdity (*) accompanying this your doctrine; since that doctrine seemeth to be absurd, which euer teacheth a doubtfull hesitation, & fluctuation of a mans fayth, touching his owne saluation.

(*) Vrged by *Kemnitius in Exam. Concil. Trid.*

Arminius.

In soluing the first Argument, I must recurre partly to the state of the Question

estion aboue set downe. True it is, *Fayth* is most certayne: neyther it be called *Fayth*, by the which a n giueth assent with any doubtful-, or feare to such thinges, the which ought to believe. But our Aduersa- *Paralogisme*, or Fallacy, resteth in s, that they assume, as grãted (which ey can neuer prooue) that remission Sinnes, or iustification do properly d soly belong to *fayth*. Agayne I say cording to the state of the question, t granting a man to haue once true th; yet followeth it not that there- e he shall finally dye in state of true th, and then it followeth, that if he not certaine of his finall perseue- nce in fayth, he therefore is not cer- ne of his *Election*, or *Predestination*.

Touching *Hope*, It is most certaine, respect of God promising; but in re- d of mans indisposition, and his kenes and frailty in performing the nditions imposed by God, *Hope* is tly languid, and accompanied with certaine feare.

Touching your argument from suppoſed absurdity, attending on doctrine herein, I reply, that the do-

ctrine maintayned by vs, though
taketh not away all feare, yet it take
away all anxiety, hesitation, and
doubtfulnes, if he may be called dou
ting, who dares not give assent to
contrary part or opinion. And as
no good inference to argue thus: *T*
man is not doubtfull nor anxious of the
tainty of his Election, therefore he is elect
So neither are you thus to dispute, *T*
man hath no certainty of his fayth, or
ction; therefore he is ever doubting
troubled with feares touching the
There is therefore a meane to be adm
ted betweene these two extremes;
wit, *a morall certainty* in respect of
Understanding, and a *Hope*, and trust
respect of the *Will*.

Enthusiastus.

Arminius, I must confesse, you ha
partly satisfyed me in displaying
vnexpected weakenes and transpare
cy of my Arguments, drawne bo
from the misapplication of Scriptur
as also from Reason. But seeing I ha
accomplished my taske of disputin
we are to change parts, therefore yo
may at your pleasure enter vpon th
stage,

ge, in seeking to warrant your con-
ry doctrine, with such proofes, as
u shall be best armed therewith: And
deed I confes, I partly begin to retire
d giue back, so little preuayling I
nd my former Arguments to be,
ich till now I accounted as many
gines, able to beat downe, and leuell
th the ground all contrary doctrine
that, for which they were vrged. But
Arminius) begin.

Arminius.

I am prepared thereto. And for the
re exact discussing of this point, I
t first ouerthrow by proofes the
pposed certainty of euery particular
ns *Iustice*. Now if a man be vncer-
ne of his *Iustice*, which is a meanes
the obtaining of Heaue, then much
re must he rest vncertaine of his
nation.

When I haue discoursed fully of the
certainty of a *Iustifying Fayth*, then
l I proceed to the impugning, by
oofes, of the imaginary *Certainty of*
vation. Now touching the first point,
ill lay downe (though it be in part
ue shewed) what is the true state

thereof. To wit, it is in expresse words thus: *Whether a man ought or can (without Speciall reuelation) be assured, through certainty of diuine fayth, that his sinnes are remitted.* In which question (*Enthusiastus*) you, and your party hould the *Affirmative*, I the *Negative*.

Now, in disprouing this aëry certainty, I will keep in part my former methode of profes, and will draw my Arguments first frō *Reason*. My first Argument then shalbe this. Nothing can be certaine (*certitudine fidei*) through certainty of *Fayth*, except it be contained eyther immediatly in the word of God, or at least deduced out of the word, by euident consequence; since *Fayth* groundeth it selfe only vpon the Authority of Gods word. But we do not find eyther immediatly, or by necessary inference in the word of God that this, or that man is truly iustifyed except some few as *Mary Magdalen*, the *Paralitticall Man*, to both whome it was sayd by our *Sauiour*: *Thy sinnes are remitted thee*.

If the Aduersary should reply here to, thus syllogizing: *The word of God teacheth, that euery one who hath true* penit-

pentance of his sinnes, is iustifyed; but I haue true repentance of my Synnes; therefore I am iustifyed. I answere heerto, that the *Assumption*, or second Proposition of this Argument is not only false, but also impossible; except it be proued by diuine Reuelation; Since we read, (q) *The hart of man is inscrutable, and who knoweth it?* (q) Ierem. 17.

Againe, we obserue, that many are perswaded to haue that, which indeed they haue not. This is euident from the example of *S. Peter*, who when he sayd; (*) *I am prepared to be imprisoned, and to suffer death*, was doubtlesly perswaded that he would suffer death for Christ; and yet the euent shewed, that he was not truly prepared thereto. Adde heerto, that the *Anabaptist* and *Anti-trinitarian* (both manifest Heretikes) do as confidently vaunt of their certainty of Iustification, as any Protestant can do: and yet it is most euident, that both of them remaine in mortall Sinne, as long as they continue in such their Religion; and consequently that they cannot be assured of their *Election*, but rather assured (during such their state) of *Reprobation*. (*) Luc. 22.

My second Argument is this. As by speciall benefit of God, it is reuealed to some few, that their Sinnes are remitted; so on the contrary syde, most Authenticall Histories record, that diuers most blessed, and holy men at the houre of their death, through their *vncertainty of iustificatio*, did greatly feare. According heerto *S. Ierome* relateth, how *Hilarion* a Holy man thus sayd at the poynt of death: *Goe out my Soule, out of this body, why art thou afrayd? Seauenty yeares thou hast serued Christ; and dost thou now feare?* And with this I heere end, touching this kind of Argument.

Enthusiastus.

I cannot deny, but that your Arguments drawne from reason, seeme to be very pressing; but I pray you ascend to other proofes.

Arminius.

My next Head of proofes shall be take fro the pens of diuers most learned and Ancient Fathers. And I will satisfy my selfe with the sentences of some few (though chiefe) among them. We

fynd *Austin* thus to write: (r) *Quatalibet iustitia &c. with what iustice soeuer man is endued, he ought to thinke, whether any thing be in him, which is to be blamed, which himselfe seeth not.* And againe: (s) *Fortasse tu nihil &c. Perhaps thou fyndest nothing in thy conscience; inuenit ille, qui melius videt; but he fyndeth in it, who seeth better*, meaning God. And finally the layd Father: (t) *Noui, quia iustitia Dei &c. I know, that the iustice of God remaineth; but whether it remaineth myne, or not, I know not. The Apostles wordes feare me, saying: who thinketh himselfe to stand, let him take heed he doth not fall.* Thus *Austin.*

(r) L. de perfect. Iustitiâ post medium.

(s) Serm. 23. de verb. Domini.

(t) In Psalm. 41.

Chrysostome: (u) *Multis de causis &c. for many causes our iudgement is vncertaine; of which one is, because we know not what our workes are.*

(u) Homil. 11. in 2. ad Corinth.

Ierome. (x) *Homo videt in facie, Deus in corde: Man seeth only the face, but God seeth the Hart: and which seemeth to vs sometymes cleane, is found to be most sordide, and foule in his eyes.*

(x) L. 3. in Ierem exponens c. 13.

Finally (to omit many others) *Basill* thus writeth of this poynt: (y) *Multa peccantes &c. we sinning in many things, many of such our sinnes, we doe not apprehend or vnderstand: wherefore the Apostle*

(y) In constit. Mon. c. 2.

ſaid: I am not guilty to my ſelfe of any thing, but neuertheles I am not iuſtifyed in this: as much as if he ſhould ſay; I ſinne in many things, but I doe not obſerue ſuch my ſinnes. Thus far of the Fathers iudgment, touching the vncertainty of our Iuſtification.

Enthuſiaſtus.

I ſhould hardly haue byn perſuaded, that the Fathers had beene ſo ſtrong in this point, as now I muſt confeſſe they are; but I pray you (*Arminius*) ryſe to your proofes of Scripture, ſince they are moſt preuayling.

Arminius.

Well then, to come to the Holy Scripture: I will reſtrayne my ſelfe only firſt to ſuch paſſages thereof, which in expreſſe words admoniſh vs, not to be ouer certayne and confident of our obtayned Iuſtice. Secondly, to ſome of thoſe places, which teach, that it is vncertayne, whether that man, which performeth his Penitency, do neuertheles obtayne remiſſion of his ſinnes, or not: and, Laſtly I will conclude this point with a demonſtration (for I can

termo

terme it no lesse) taken from the example of *Dauid*.

And to begin with the first sort, we thus read: (z) *Passe the tyme of your dwelling here in feare.* Agayne, (a) *Worke your Saluation with feare and trembling.* And finally: (b) *Blessed is that man, who is euer fearefull.* But if a man be infallibly assured of his Iustification, how can he be fearefull thereof?

(z) 1. Pet. 1.
(a) Philip. 2.
(b) Prou. 2.

To come to the second branch of Texts, teaching, That a man performing sorrow, and being penitent for his Sinnes, notwithstanding is not assured of the remission of his Sinnes: Now according hereto we read, (c) *Repent of thy wickednes, and pray to God, si forte remittatur tibi; if chance it may be forgiuen thee.* In like sort it is said: (d) *Who can tell, if God will turne and pardon vs?* &c. And the same words are in *Ioel*, &c. And finally we further thus read: (e) *Perhaps God will pardon thine offences.*

(c) Acts 8.
(d) Ionas 3.
(e) Daniel 4.

Now heere (*Enthusiastes*) I referre euen to your iudgement, and to the iudgment of all heere present, whether this doubtfulnes of Remission of Sinnes, and the former Admonition, that we should not rest ouer secure of our

Iustice

Iustice (both which points are prooued from the two former *Classes* of Scripture) stand not wholy incompatible with our Aduersaries presumed infallible certainty of their owne *Iustification*.

Enthusiastus.

I freely grant, that these Texts do seeme to eneruate and weaken the doctrine of the certainty of *Iustification*; But I pray you proceed to that example of the Prophet Dauid, which aboue (for it is conuincing) you called *a Demonstration*.

Arminius.

Well I come to *Dauid*, whose example is a sealing Argument, closing vp this point, and affordeth to vs a certainty of Truth, touching the vncertainty of mans *Iustification*. Thus then I vrge: Yf *Charity* can be lost, then *fayth* can be lost; if *Fayth* can be lost, then *Iustification* may be lost. My first proposition is warranted by the doctrine of vs all, (f) who teach, that *Charity* doth as necessarily accompany a *Iustifying fayth*, as *heate doth the fyre*.

(f) D. Fulke against the

That

That *Charity* may be loſt, is proued from the example of *Dauid*, who killed *Vrias*: ſeeing a voluntary pretended murther (and ſuch was that of *Dauids*) is a meere priuation of *Charity*. For how can we loue that man with true *Charity*, whom we intend to murther, and deprive of his life? Now the Euangeliſt aſſureth vs, that (g) *Who loueth not his brother, is not of God, but abideth in death.* From hence then the vnauoydable reſultancy is, that *Dauid* in the murther of *Vrias*, and during all the tyme before his repentance thereof was not of *God*, but for the tyme abode *in death*, and conſequently neyther had *Charity nor fayth*; for if he had *fayth*, he had not abyded *in death*, becauſe it is written: (h) *By fayth the iuſt man liueth.*

Rhem. Teſtament in 1. Cor. 3. ſayth: Fayth cannot be without Charity.

(g) 1. Iohn 3.

(h) 2. Iohn.

Enthuſiaſtus.

I haue read ſome of our learned Brethren, labouring to auoyd this Argument by anſwering, that *Dauids fayth* was not loſt in his murther of *Vrias*, but only for the tyme *ſlept*. And others doe affirme, that *Dauid* when he committed murther and adultery, (i) *was, and remained the child of God, & did not fall from his*

(i) D. Fulke in the diſ-

his fayth. And another great man amog vs affirmes, *that* (k) *at one, and the same time, Dauid sinned, and sinned not.*

(k) Beza in respons. ad Art. Colloq. Montisbelgar. part. altera p. 73.

Arminius.

Tush (*Enthusiastus*) all this is but a froath of words, seruing only to bleare the eyes of the ignorant; but it is wholy dissolued with the least touch of a iudicious finger. And to the first and second part of your Answere: Either *Dauid* had *fayth* at the tyme of his murthering of *Vrias*, or he had it not (for no *Medium* can be giuen betweene these two *Extremes*.) Yf he had *fayth*, how then could his fayth be said to *sleepe*?

(l) Galat. 5.

(m) Iacob. 2.

Agayne, the Nature of true *fayth* requireth, that it should be euer (l) *Working with Charity*, and *that without Workes it is* (m) *dead*. Yf *Dauid* hath not *fayth* at that time, then is that grated, which I demanded, to wit, that *Dauid* in the murther of *Vrias* lost his *fayth*, and consequently was not assured of his *Iustification*. Thus you see, that this your euasion is nothing els, then a poore begging of the point, as granted, which is still in controuersy, to wit, that *Dauid* still kept his fayth, at the tyme he killed

killed *Vrias*.

Now, to that other last kind of Answere, (to wit, *that at one, and the same time Dauid sinned, and sinned not*) I much wonder, that it did euer fall from a learned mans pen; so phantasticall, inexplicable, and indeed absurd it is. But to proceed, this Answere implies, that *Dauid* sinned (let it be in what respect soeuer the Author of this Answere will haue:) Yf then *Dauid* sinned, then *Dauid* by such his Sinne was the seruant of sinne, and of the Diuell; for we reade that, (n) *He that committeth sinne, is the seruant of Sinne.* And againe: *He that committeth Sinne, is of the* (o) *Deuill.* And thus far touching this *Demonstration*.

(n) Iohn. 8.

(o) 1. Iohn. 3.

Enthusiastus.

I grant indeed, that this your Argument drawne from the example of *Dauid* is most strong, and I now well perceaue, how sleightly my Answere thereto was wouen, vpon seuerall threeds, but all to illaqueate & ensnare a weake iudgment. But (*Arminius*) you hauing now finished (as I take it) all your proofes for the disprouing of the cer-

certainty of mans *Iustification*; the Methode requireth, that you vnder take the like labour touching the di proouing the certainty of *Predestination*: though I cannot but grant, tha the impugning of this later point is vertually inuolued in the impugning of the former. For let vs once grant, that man resteth vncertayne of his *Iustification*, it then ineuitably from thence may be inferred (as your selfe aboue did intimate) that he also resteth vncertain of his *Election* and *Predestination*; since *Iustification* is a necessary *Medium* to *Election* and *Predestination*; for no men are *elected* or *predestinated* by God, but such as are finally *iustifyed*. Yet notwithstanding this most necessary interueniency of these two points, I would willingly heare your particular proofes, for the particular point of the vncertainty of *Election* or *Predestination*.

Arminius.

I will satisfy your desire. And first not to lose tyme, I will keepe my former Methode in producing of my proofes. And therefore for the impugning of *Election*, and *Predestination*,

wh

will begin with Arguments drawne from Reason. Of which, my first Argument is this: The knowledge by *Faith* of a mans present *Iustice* is more easy, then the knowledge by faith of eternall *Predestination*: But it is abouo prooued, that no man can tell, whether he be worthy of hate of loue, in respect of his present *Iustice*, or hate in this world, much lesse can he be certayne, whether he be worthy of hate or loue in respect of Gods decree, which decree lyeth in the *Abisme* of his owne iudgment.

My second Argument: We can haue no certaine knowledge of such things, as depend of the will of God, but only by manifest reuelation of God himselfe: But *Predestination* doth depend of the will of God: Therefore *Predestination* is to man vncertaine. If you reply, that God hath reuealed by his spirit in the Scripture, that all those, who rightly beleeue, and liue well, shall haue eternall life and beatitude, I grant this is true; but I deny that God euer reuealed in Scripture, *that all those, who (as) they beleeue, do rightly beleeue and liue as they ought*. For if it were sufficient to

I say,

say, *I do beleeue and liue as I ought to do*, then should all *Heretikes* be saued, seeing euery of them will say, that he beleeueth and liueth as he ought. Thus much for some delibation, and taste of what Arguments (omitting diuers others) may be drawne from reason in proofe of this verity.

But in this next place, I will come to the Testimonies of many *Protestants* accomplished (in the highest degree) with learning, who through the weight of diuine and humane Authority, urged in proofe of so warrantable a Truth, haue in the end vpon their more retired and impartiall Iudgments pulled thereupon, wholy comparted with vs in the doctrine heere maintained. And to begin with those, who are commonly called *Caluinists*, we fynd, that *Snecanus*, and *Hemingius* (two learned *Caluinists*) are so full in this doctrine of the vncertainty *of Saluation*, that *D. Willet* (our Aduersary herein) thus reprehendeth them: (p) *These Patrones of Vniuersall Grace and conditionall Election, consequently hould, that men may loose their Election and Faith: Hemingius p. 30. The same is also maintayned by Snecanus. p. 970.*

(p) In his Synopsi. p. 811.

Thus

thus far *D. Willet. D. Harsenet* is so full in our doctrine, that he preached in proofe thereof a Sermo at *Pauls* Crosse. *M. Perkins* (though our Aduersary in this doctrine, yet) through racke of Truth, is thus forced to confesse of the Elect: (r) *This Testimony of being perswaded, that we are adopted & chosen in Christ &c. is weake in most men, and can scarcely be perswaded.* And of the *Reprobate*, who take themselues to be in the number of the *Elect*, he further thus teacheth: (s) *They may do outwardly all things, which true Christians do; They do willingly subiect themselues to the Ministry of the word, & are as forward as any, and as ioyfull in frequenting sermons &c. They are also voyd of Hypocrisy, and herein dissemble not that faith, which they haue not, but rather shew that faith which they haue. Thus a man being in this state, may deceaue himselfe, and the most godly in the world, which haue the greatest gift of discerning, how they and their brethren stand before the Lord.* Thus *M. Perkins.*

And according to this his doctrine, the *Anabaptists* (who were burned in *Smithfield*) euen at their death vaunted of the certainty of their Saluation, and

(r) M. Perkins in his foure Treatises, necessarily to be considered of all Christians. Treatise fourth subiect. 1. (s) In the epistle to the Reader in the beginning of the foresaid Booke.

yet were therein deceaued, euen in the iudgment of (t) *Caluin*. But to proceed to others. *Musculus* (the great Protestant) doth thus teach of this point: (u) *If he, who hath beene made partaker of the Heauenly grace, do fall from that Grace, and of a iust and faythfull man, do become vniust and vnfaythfull &c. this mans conscience (the purity of fayth being lost) is made guilty vnto damnation.* And M. Robert *Rollock*, once Rectour of the Vniuersity of *Edenburgh* (a man much esteemed by *Beza*) thus writeth (x) *I tell thee, that notwithstanding thou art redeemed, and by this bloud of Christ freed from Sinne and death; yet if thou takest delight in Sinne, the greater shall be thy damnation.*

Now to come to others, commonly stiled *Lutheranes*. And to passe ouer (y) *Conradus Schlussenburg*, (z) *Haffenreffensis* Professour in the Vniuersity of *Tubing*, (a) *Rungius* Professour in the Vniuersity of *Wittemberg*, (b) *Iacobus Andreas*, (c) *Gesnerus* Professour *in Witemberg*, and diuers other learned followers of *Luther*, all maintayning the vncertainty of Saluation; we fynd *Melancthon* thus expressly to write:

(d) *Ex-*

(t) *Calu. cont. Anabaptist. p.* 120. & 121.

(u) *In loc. Com. loc. de Peccato. sect.* 5. 20.

(x) In his booke of Lectures vpon the *epist.* of Paul to the Colossians. *Lect.* 6. 2. 1. *p.* 64.

(y) *In Theolog. Calumist. l.* 1. *art.* 14. Who these reproueth Caluin, *Zanchius*, and the Diuines of *Geneua*.

(z) *In locis Theolog. pag* 188. & 331.

(a) *In disput* 17 *ex epist. Pauli ad Cor.*

(d) *Excidunt homines à gratia &c. Men do fall from Grace, and do loose their iustifying grace &c.* In like sort (e) the *Confession of Auspurg* condemneth the doctrine of Certainty of Saluation for *Anabaptisme.* And accordingly (f) *Lobechius* (Doctor, and Professour in the Vniuersity of *Rostocke*) defendeth our doctrine heerein, and he alleadgeth in proofe thereof *the Confession of Augusta*, and diuers Texts of Scripture, charging the defendours of the contrary doctrine, *with Anabapticticall Errour.*

In like sort, *Kempnitius* writeth thus of this point: (g) *True liuely iustifying fayth may be lost, and the party made guilty of eternall damnation.* Finally (not to charge your memory with a surplusage of the learned Protestants iudgment heerein) the Protestant Diuines of *Saxony* do in their *publike Confession* thus teach: (h) *It is manifest, that who are regenerate &c. are agayne reiected by God, and made subiect to eternall punishment.* And further: (i) *Iustification and regeneration may be shaken of, and we lose eternall life.* Thus much touching the most learned Protestants in this matter of *Vncertainty* of *Election*, and *Predestination.*

posteriori parte Thesi 5.
(b) In epitom. Colloq. Montisbelgar. p. 47. & 48.
(c) In disput. 17. pro sanctissimo libro Concord. disput. 10. p. 650.
(d) Melancth. in Concil. Theolog. pag. 112.
(e) In the harmony of Confessions in English. pag. 224.
(f) In his Disputat. Theolog. p. 317. & 318.
(g) Kempnit. in his Exam. Concil.

Trident. printed anno 1578. part. 2. p. 293. & vide part. 1. pag. 190.

(h) In the Harmony of Confessions in English. p. 80. & p. 233.

(i) Harmony &c. p. 295.

Enthusiastus.

Indeed I rest halfe amazed at the pregnant Testimonies of so many of our owne learned Brethren in defence of this your doctrine, and I freely confesse, I would neuer haue believed, that so many of them, and of such eminency, had with so strong an endeauour maintayned the same, but that I fynd you so punctuall and precise in alleadging their owne cleare wordes in behalfe thereof. But I pray you (*Arminius*) proceed to other of your proofes.

Arminius.

Before I proceed to other proofes, I must subnect to this former discourse one obseruation touching the iudgments of our owne learned and Reuerend Brethren, either in this point, or in the doctrine of *Freewill* aboue disputed of, or of any other point hereafter to be discoursed of betweene vs at this tyme. The obseruation is this: that whereas all these eminent Protestants already produced by me, or hereafter to be produced, do with an vnanimous consent teach, That no dogmaticall

point is to be believed, as an Article of faith (they wholy reiecting all *Traditions*) but what hath its proofe out of the Scripture, either immediatly in expresse wordes, or els by necessary inference deduced from the Scripture; that therefore we may truly inferre, that all these Learned men doe ground themselues only vpon Scripture, for their maintayning of the said doctrines; and consequently that they conspire with me in the expositions of the said passages of Scripture, already or hereafter to be alleaged by me.

And further, seeing the Scripture cannot teach contrary doctrines; it followeth, that our said learned Brethren by me produced, do interpret with vs (and contrary to your construction giuen of them) all such Countertexts of Scripture heretofore vrged, or hereafter to be vrged by you (*Enthusiastes*) for the impugning of those our said doctrines. And now this Aduertisement being premised, I hasten in this next place to the Authority of the Ancient Fathers and Doctours of Christs Church.

And first, *Gregory the Great* thus

writeth: (k) *Quia inducium omnipotentis Dei imperscrutabile est &c.* Because the iudgment of God is vnsearcheable, therefore man knoweth not from whence he commeth, or whither he goeth: The Reason hereof being, in that it cannot be knowne, whether a man shall persevere vnto his end in that Grace, which he receiueth.

(k) In primum Regum.

(l) L. 2. de Vocatione Gentium. cap. vltim.

Prosper: (l) *De nullo ante ipsius finem &c.* We cannot pronounce before hand of any man, that he shall be in the glory of the Elect. And this profitable feare doth preserue in man a persevering humility, that so who standeth may take heed, that he doe not fall.

(m) De Ciuit. Dei. l. 2. c. 18.

Austin is most full, thus writing: (m) *Licet Sancti de sua perseuerantiæ præmio certi sunt, de ipsa tamen perseuerantia sua reperiuntur incerti &c.* Although Holy men be assured of the reward of their perseuerance; yet of their perseuerance it selfe, they are found to be vncertaine. For what man can know, that he shall persevere in practise and progresse of Iustice till his end, except it be made knowne to him by some Reuelation?

(n) L. de Corrept. & gratia. c. 13.

Againe the same Father thus further amplifyeth vpon this point: (n) *Quis ex multitudine fidelium &c.* Which of

the

the multitude of the faithfull, as long as he liueth in this mortality, can presume himselfe to be in the number of the predestinate?

And further, speaking of *Election*, he thus sayth: (o) *Vtrum quis hoc munus &c.* *It is vncertaine who hath receaued this gift, as long as he leadeth this life.* (o) L. de bono perseuerantiæ. c. 12.

Ierome subscribes to the same censure, thus writing: (p) *Ne beatum dixeris quempiam ante mortem &c.* *Thou shalt not call any man blessed before his death; for as long as we liue, so long we are in battayle, or fight; And as long as we are in battayle, so long there is no certaine Victory.* (p) L. 2. aduers. Pelagium.

To contract this point touching the Fathers iudgements herein, I will end with *Chrysostome*; his wordes are these: (q) *Si Paulus, qui tanta passus est &c.* *If S. Paul, who suffred so great matters, was not yet secure of his Resurrection, what then shall we say?* Thus far concerning the Fathers in the point of Vncertainty of mans *Election*, or *Predestination*. (q) Hom. 11. in epist. ad Philip.

Ensebastus.

I can reply little to these so cleare and euident places of the Fathers; and indeed I cannot but confesse, that the said Fathers did wholy teach the do-

drine, which now you at this present do defend? But I am desirous to see what Texts you can produce out of Gods sacred Writ, to fortify this, the Fathers, and your doctrine.

Arminius.

Gods Holy word affoardeth plentifull store thereof; & those so illustrious and evident, that both the Fathers & the former alledged Brethren might securely rest themselues thereon, for teaching and believing of this doctrine. And to beginne. I will reduce my Authorities for aduantaging your memory vnto certaine Heads, as in my former proofes I haue done. Now my first Head shall contayne such Texts, as teach that our Saluation doth partly depend vpon the Cõdition of our workes: but if it be vncertaine, whether a man shall continue in the exercise of good workes; then must it follow, that our Saluation (as partly resting vpon our workes) must be most vncertaine. Of this Nature (among others) are these few Texts following: *No man shall be crowned, but who shall lawfully fight.* (r) 2. Tim. 2. Again: (s) *If thou wilt enter into lyfe, keep* (s) Matth. 19.

the

the Commandements. And more: (t) *If we suffer with him, that we may be also glorifyed with him.* And lastly: (u) *Except your Iustice do abound more, then the Iustice of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter into the Kingdome of Heauen.*

(t) Rom. 8.

(u) Matth. 5.

Enthusiastus.

To these Texts it may well perhaps be replyed, that good workes are required to Saluation, not as a Condition upon which eternall lyfe dependeth; but only because true fayth cannot be without good workes: since bad and wicked workes (we obserue by experience) do exile, and banish away all true fayth.

(x)

(y)

(z)

(a)

(b)

Arminius.

I do not heere labour to search the reason, why good workes are necessary (since this to the present point is impertinent) only I rest satisfyed, if you grant, that good workes are necessarily required, and that without them we cannot obtaine eternal life: for once admitting this, then it most consequently may be inferred, that no man without speciall Reuelation can assure himselfe

to

to be of the number of the *Elect*: seeing no man (euen in the iudgement of our Aduersaries in this doctrine) can rest assured, whether he performeth, & shall to his liues end performe all such good workes, as are prescribed by Christ to him to exercise.

2. My second branch of Scripturall Testimonies shall respect those Scriptures which counsell vs to Feare, touching our spirituall state. Among others these heer alledged shall serue: (x) *Worke your Saluation, with feare and trembling*. Againe: the Prophet exhorteth, thus saying: (y) *Serue the Lord in feare, and reioyce in trembling: Apprehend discipline, least the Lord be angry, and you perish out of the iust way*. And more (z) *Hold fast that thou hast, least another take thy crowne*. And further (a) *who standeth, let him take heed, he do not fall*. And lastly (to omit many other such like feare-full admonitions:) (b) *Looke to, that you do not loose things, which you haue wrought*. Now to what end are all these dreadfull Sentences, if so a man be certayne of his owne *Predestination*?

(x) Philip. 2.
(y) Psalm. 2.
(z) Apoc. 3.
(a) 1. Cor. 10.
(b) Iohn.

Enthu-

Enthusiastus.

These sentences of the Holy Scripture may be well deliuered only to expell that torpour, sluggishnes, and carnall security, which otherwise maketh Christians negligent in good workes: yet from hence it followeth not, that any danger should be, that the *Iust* should finally fall from their Saluation.

(*) So answere *Calum vbi suprà & Kempnit. in Exam. Concil. Trident.*

Arminius.

If this your Answere were solide and satisfactory, then would it follow, (a thing not once to be dreamed) that the *Holy Ghost* should persuade men to Infidelity, by persuading them to feare their owne saluation. For doth not he persuade a mã to Infidelity, who should persuade him to feare & rest doubtfull, whether Christ be the sonne of God, or no? Therefore when we are commanded to feare, we ought not, nor cannot rest certayne (*certitudine fidei*) that we are of the number of the predestinated: though we may and ought to haue great hope thereof. But to proceed to a third Head

The sacred Scripture teacheth, that diuers who for a tyme, haue believed,

ued, yet after haue made shipwrack of their fayth. And according hereto we (e) 1. Tim. 4. read thus: (e) *In the later dayes, there shall depart certaine from the fayth.* And againe (d) *Errauerunt a fide, they erred from the fayth.* Now the Scripture teacheth vs, that it is vncertaine, whether a man losing once grace and fayth shall after be restored to grace and fayth. For (as I obserued aboue) it is said. (e) *Quis scit, si conuertatur, & Dominus ignoscat? Who knoweth, if he will returne, that God may pardon him?*

(e) Ioel. 2.

Now, if many beleiuing truly, do after fall from their fayth, & are thereby become *Reprobates*, and that they are not assured, that after they shall be restored to the Fayth and Grace of God (as these Testimonies next aboue alleged do proue) what other Inference can be made, then that a man is not certaine of his *Iustification*, and consequently of his *Predestination*? seeing certainty of *Predestination* (as is aboue said) cannot be had without certainty of Perseuerance in fayth and Iustice, as a proper *Medium* of *Predestination*, without which *Predestination* cannot be obtained.

To

To all these former sacred passages of Scripture, alleadged in proofe of the uncertainty of mans Predestination, may be addressed these passages following, though not already ranged to any Classe or Head: (f) *If we abide in his goodnes, otherwise we shall be cut off.* Agayne: (g) *Some do repell faith, and a good conscience,* (h) *and are fallen from Grace.* And more, (i) *Some, who perchance illuminated, haue tasted also the heauenly gift, & were partakers of the Holy Ghost, &c. are fallen,* and so dangerously, *that it is impossible* (meaning therby, *very hard*) *for them to be renewed againe to repentance.* And yet further: (k) *The boughes may be broken of.* Yea we read, that those, who are said (l) *to be written in Gods booke* (to wit, in regard of their present Grace & Iustice) are notwithstanding laid vpon their relapse, or fall, (m) *to be razed, & blotted forth.*

(f) Hebr. 4.
(g) 1. Tim. 1. (q)
(h) Gal. 5.
(i) Hebr. 6.
(k) Rom. 11.
(l) Exod. 32. & Psalm. 69.
(m) See Moyses words hereof in Exod. 32. and Gods Answere thereto.

Now then in regard of the vncertainty of mans *Iustification, Election,* and *Predestination* (prooued from these & many other Texts of Gods Holy word aboue produced) the Apostle had reason to burst forth into this exclamation: (n) *O how incomprehensible are his iudgments? &c.*

(n) Rom. 11.

For who hath knowne the mynd of the Lord, or who hath beene his Counsellour? Which Holy Apostle out of his own vncertainty of *Predestination*, in this solicitous and carefull manner spake of himselfe: (o) *If by any meanes, I may come to the Resurrection, which is from the dead;* (p) *Least perhaps, when I haue preached to others, my selfe become a Reprobate.*

(o) Philip. 3.

(p) 2. Cor. 2.

And thus far from the Holy Scriptures touching the *vncertainty* of our *Election* and *Predestination*; putting you in mynd, *Enthusiastus*, as afore I haue done, that all the former proofes aboue alledged out of Scripture eyther for the fortifying of *Freewill* in man, or for the impugning of the certainty of Iustification, do implicitly and consequently prooue the vncertainty of *Predestination*. For once granting *Freewill* to be in man, or that his present Iustice is vncertaine; then followeth it, that by his freedome of will, he may relinquish his former Iustice, and thereupon loose his *Predestination*.

Enthusiastus.

Arminius I partly yield to you in this discourse, in regard of the cloud

of

of most pertinent Authorities by you alledged: But yet before we giue the last close to this our disputation, we are according to my intended methode, to discourse of the Question of *Reprobation*, diuersly holden by you and me. Touching the which doctrine I must aforehand say: that in regard of these our former disputes of *Freewill*, *Iustification* and *Predestination* my diuining thoghts partly foretell me, that your Proofes wilbe perhaps as forcing for that, as they seeme to haue beene for these former doctrines.

Notwithstanding I would most willingly haue this Question throughly discussed, before we breake of. And therefore what Authorities eyther out of the word of God, or otherwise I shall alleadge in proofe of the doctrine, I hould therein; I alledge them, not so much with an absolute and resolued mynd of contradicting, as with a desire of receauing full Answere and satisfaction from you, touching the said Authorities.

Arminius.

I doubt litle, but I shall be as able

so vnty those knots of doubts, which yet you haue in the Question of *Reprobation*, as already I haue done in the former. Therefore *Enthusiastus* you may proceed to instance in your authorityes, which may seeme (though but in an imparriall eye) to fortify your doctrine, yet imbraced by you therein.

Enthusiastus.

I will, and continuing in the tract of the methode by me aboue obserued, I will first produce my testimonies out of the holy Scriptures. But before I come to them, I hould it very pertinent to shew, what the chiefe Patrones of *Reprobation* do hould therein. Thus then some chiefe men and their fellowers do write: (q) *That God doth create some men to perdition, appointeth them to his hatred and destruction*: and againe, *that God doth decree them to destruction*. Further maintayning (to vse their owne wordes:) (r) *That God did not suffer death for them*. But some others, as remarkable as the former, more fully enlarge themselues, thus endoctrinating their Schollers: (s) *God doth ordaine by his Counsell and decree that among men, some be borne destined to*

(q) Beza in his Treatise englished, and intituled: A displey of Popish practises. p. 27. & 32.

(r) Beza in respons. ad Acta Colloq. Montisbelg. pag. 225. & 221.

(s) Calu. Instit. l. 3. c. 23 sect. 6.

eter-

certaine damnation frō their mothers wombe who by their destruction may glorify God.

Arminius.

This doctrine is of so horrid a nature, as that I can hardly be induced to believe, that any good Christian will euer maintayne it in so full a manner, as it is by you literally deliuered; but rather they teach it with some qualification and mitigation; as perhaps their meaning is, that God doth ordaine some to destruction, by reason of his foresight of their wicked liues; And also that Christ did dye for the *Reprobate*, *non efficaciter*, but *sufficienter*, not *effectually*; whereby the *Reprobate* should actually partake of the benefit of his death (if so themselues will) but only *sufficiently*; that is, that his death was of sufficient valew in it selfe to saue the *Reprobate*.

Enthusiastus.

I would to God (*Arminius*) I could thus charitably (and withall truly) apologize for my owne Brethren, as you (though their Aduersary herein) do now in their behalfe. But the matter

standeth so, as that their owne words do wholy preclude them of all such favourable Constructions. For first, to your firster wordes; touching Gods foresight of the wicked liues of the *Reprobate*; one of them in expresse words thus writeth: (t) *God hath ordayned some to be vessels of wrath, without any respect had to their workes, either good, or bad.* And another as plainly teacheth, thus saying: (u) *Sinnes foreseene, are not the cause of Reprobation.*

(t) D. Willet in Synop. p. 334.

(u) Peter Martyr in his Common Places. part. 2. pa. 18.

And as touching the distinction (by you deliuered) of Christ suffering *sufficienter*, not *efficaciter*; some of our most learned Brethren (I relate it with griefe) call this distinction, (x) *A meere tergiuersation, and impertinent to the point in question*: and therefore the same learned mā restraineth the death of Christ in these wordes, *ad solos Electos*; to wit, that his death was only for the *Elect*. Yea they proceed so far herein, as that they peremptorily maintayne (pardon me in relating their owne words) that (y) *many Infants* (meaning of beliuing Parents) *though baptized, are damned by the secret decree of God.*

(x) Beza in Respons. ad Art. Colloq. Montisbelg. part. altera. pag. 217. & 221.

(y) Beza in Respons. ad Art. Montisbelg part. altera. in Præfat. pag. 11. & 183.

Armi-

Arminius.

You haue sufficiently inough laid open your owne Brethrens blemishes and scarres; So full hould (it seemes) those words of *Austin* hath taken of you: (z) *Truth is more forcible to wring out Confession, then any Rack or Torment.*) But now if it please you, you may come to your proofes of Scriptures, for this their doctrine. Only I must tell you by the way, that the more direfull and execrable any doctrine is, the further off it is from receauing any fortifying from the word of God, being deliuered in its true and native sense, or Construction.

(z) Contra Donatist. post Col. c. 24.

Enthusiastus.

I fully graunt so much with you: Neuertheles for my owne further satisfying (since vnresolued doubts secretly beate vpon the vnderstanding) I will relate the chiefest Texts vrged by my Brethren in defence of this their doctrine. First then they insist in those wordes: (a) *Christ* (*) *is the chiefe Corner stone &c. vnto you, which believe, pretious; but vnto them that believe not &c. a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, to them,*

(a) 1. Pet. 2.

(*) Objected by *Bera in Annot. in Nou. Test. in 1. Petr. c. 2.*

them, which stumble at the word, being disobedient, vnto which things they were ordained. From hence now they inferre, that God was the Authour of their disobedience, to the which disobedience they were by God ordained, and consequently ordayned to damnation, the fruit of their disobedience.

Arminius.

The difficulty of this Text resteth in those last wordes, *Vnto which things*, (meaning in your brethrens sense, *disobedience, and stumbling at the Word*) *they were ordayned.* But heere I iustify, the Translation is not pure and sincere, since the words, viz. *They were ordayned*, haue true reference vnto those former words, viz. *Which believe*; And so the true meaning of this place is, *that they were ordayned to believe.* And thus you see, this place being truly vrged, maketh directly against your Brethren. Now I iustify this my Answere from the Greeke Text; the words are these: ἀπειθοῦντες, εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν. *Nec credunt, in quo & positi sunt.*

The sense thereof being, *that they were ordayned to believe, but did not.* That

point

point is so euident, that diuers learned Protestants do giue the same construction thereof with me. For *Snecanus* reciting the Text in these wordes: (b) *Nec credunt in quod positi fuerant*, neither do they beliene, vnto which they were ordayned, thus answereth: *Refertur proprie à doctissimis &c.* This last clause is properly referred by most learned and Orthodox all men, yea euen by Caluin himselfe, to the Iewes, who were placed to beliene. And the very same Construction thereof is giuen by (c) *Castalio*: So little doth this Text aduantage your Brethren, but rather disaduantage them: and yet your Brethrens integrity and candour was wanting in them translating the Greeke word, ἐτέθησαν. *Were ordayned*; the word truly signifying only *Positi erant*. But proceed to others.

(b) In Method. descripe. pag. 701.

(c) In defens. Transl. pag. 152. 153. 154.

Enthusiastus.

The next shalbe that passage: (d) *The Lord* (*) *made all things for himselfe, euen the wicked for the day of Euill*. From whence my Brethren deduce, that God maketh, or createth wicked men to Eternity of damnation, which may be truly called, *The day of Euill*.

(d) Prouerb. 16.

(*) Obiected by D. Fulke against the *Rhem.* Testam. in *Rom.* 9. fol. 253.

Arminius.

Doe your Brethren vrge this place to proue, that God maketh certaine men to be wicked? Yf so, how then can they free God, from being the *Author of Sinne?* A *Paradox*, or rather a blasphemy ((e) besides that diuers of themselues shame, at least in wordes, to be reputed Patrones therof) directly repugnant to other Texts of Scripture, as where it is said: (f) *Non Deus volens iniquitatem tu es. Thou art a God, that hatest iniquity.* Is it not their intention to draw the foresaid Inference from those wordes? To what end then doe they alleadge it, since it is then in that respect most impertunetly vrged? How doe they extricate themselues out of this *Labyrinth?*

(e) As D. Fulk in his defence of the English Translation. pag. 300. D. Whitak contra Durœum. l. 2. pag. 324.

(f) Psalm. 5.

Therefore for the better deprehending the true Construction of the foresaid passage, we are to conceaue, that *Gods making, or creating of man* in the former words hath reference to mans *Materiality* (if I may vse that word) that is, to him, as he is *man*, abstracting him from his *Morality*; but it hath no reference to his wickednes; so man (as he is

man)

un) is created by God, but as *Man is wicked*, he cannot be sayd to be created of him; since in this later sense God should be the cause and Authour of his wickednes, whereas his wickednes is from himselfe. And so if he be wicked, then God ordayneth him to the *day of Euill*, that is, to the day of punishment; and this he doth, *for himselfe*, that is, for his *owne glory*. The lyke saying by *Anallogy*, may be vsed of Princes, who may (in a restrayned sense) be sayd to ordaine Malefactours to punishments; & yet the Princes are neither willing, nor Authours of their Subiects offeces. This our exposition of the former place is so naturall and genuine, as that it is acknowledged for true by (g) *Bullinger*, (h) *Hiperius*, and *Philip* (i) *Marbachius*, all learned Protestants.

(g) In his Decads in English. p. 494.
(h) In Method. Theolog. pag. 418.
(i) In his disput. Theolog. de Prouidentia Dei. sect. 147.

Enthusiastus.

What Answere *Arminius* can be giuen to that (at least seeming) pregnant Text: (k) *Hath not the Potter* (*) *power ouer the clay, euen of the same lumpe, to make one vessell vnto honour, and another vnto dishonour? What if God willing to shew his wrath &c. suffered with long patience the*

(k) Rom. 9.
(*) M. Willet in Synops. 534.

vessels of wrath, ordayned to destruction. Now this place seemeth to euict, that God euen without any preuisiō of workes ordaineth some men (being parts of the *Masse*, or Lumpe of mankind) *to damnation.*

Arminius.

I will be partly silent herein, & *Austin*, with some learned Brethren of our owne, & the *Apostle* himselfe shall answere thereto for me. And first I find *Austin* to paraphrase this Text in these wordes: (l) *Hæc Massa &c. If this masse* (he meaning the Masse, or Lumpe, whereof the Apostle speaketh) *were so indifferent, that as it deserued no good, so also it deserued no Euill; not without cause it might be thought iniquity, that thereof there should be made certaine vessels to dishonour. But seeing, that by the Free will of the first man, the whole Masse did become guilty of Condemnation, it is without doubt of Gods mercy, that thereof are made certaine Vessels to honour &c. and of his Iudgment* (meaning his Iustice) *that other Vessels are made to dishonour.* Thus far *Austin.* According to whose iudgment we see, that it is not Gods absolute decree,

(l) Epist. 105. ad Paulinum. & epist. 105. ad Sixtum.

without

without respect to mans wickednes foreseene; but it is Sinne, which is the cause, why some vessels are made to dishonour, or damnation.

Now *Hyperius* (a learned Protestant) shall further answere for me, who sayth, That (m) *the long patience (mentioned in the Text) wherewith God suffred the Vessels of wrath, demonstrateth, that they were created good, and afterward became euill of their proper will; They being made vessels of wrath, because voluntarily they were to become Euill.* Thus *Hiperius*: So certaine it is, that their Creation of being *Vessels* was of God; but being *Vessels of wrath*, was from their sinnes foreseene.

(m) *In Method. Theologo. l. 2. pag. 438.*

I will conclude this point euen with the *Apostles* explanation of this place, who expressely sayth; *That* (n) *if a Vessel vnto dishonour, shall cleanse it selfe, it shall become a Vessel vnto Honour*; So far was the *Apostle* from iudging, that God did absolutely ordayne any man to destruction and damnation, without respect and reference to his Sinnes and Impiety. Thus farre of this place, illustrated by the *Apostle*, *Austin*, and the former learned Protestant. And for the

(n) *2. Tim. 2. 20. 21.*

closure

closure of all, I will adioyne to the Authorities, my owne Obseruation touching our Aduersaries, in this Controuersy, their trāslating out of Greeke for their owne aduantage, these words, *Ordayned to destruction*; whereas it is in the Greeke only, κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν, that is, *Made apt to destruction*. And according hereto, it is in the Latin Text, *Apta ad interitum*.

Enthusiastus.

I cannot, nor will not reply against the Apostles iudgment herein: But yet there remayne behind diuers briary passages of Scripture (as I may tearme them) that a man can hardly fall vpon them without danger: As where we read: (o) *As many as were ordayned to eternall life, beleeued*; implying hereby, by the restraint of the former words, that some were ordained to destruction.

(o) Act. 13.

Arminius.

This Argument may be taken away seuerall wayes. First, because it speaketh only of the *Predestinate*, not touching (at least in words) *the Reprobate*.

Second-

Secondly, that admitting, the words of the Text were by sequele to concerne the *Reprobate*: yet they prooue not (which is only the issuable point in this controuersy to be proued) a reall *Reprobation*, or ordaining to damnation without respect of Sinne foreseene, but only a not ordayning to Mercy, or a iust dereliction of the wicked for their owne Sinnes.

Thirdly and lastly I say, That whereas these former wordes are deliuered by *S. Luke*, & withall whereas our Aduersaries Inference heer is, *That those, who did not then beleiue, were ordayned to damnation*; now to dreame, that the opinion of our Aduersaries should be the true meaning of *S. Luke*, is (I will not say improbable, but) most absurd. My reason is this: The Text there sheweth, that, (p) The whole Citty came togeather to heare, viz: that *Sermon*. By which words it appeareth, that this assembly consisted of all sorts of persons, as yong, old, women, men &c. Now who is so stupid as to thinke, that of all that great concourse, they only were saued, who at that tyme were conuerted by that Sermon? For shall we think

(p) *Act.* 13.

that

that all the rest of that assembly were *Reprobates*, and could not after be reduced to the fayth of Christ? So impertinently you see (*Enthusiastus*) in a mistrutination of the wordes, this Text is alleadged. But proceed further; For I assure my self, I shall not meet in al this discourse with any one Text, which will force my vnderstanding; much lesse necessarily euict the point questioned.

Enthusiastus.

I take your Answere as partly satisfying; but because there are some few Texts behind, which by my neere entercourse among my Brethren, I haue heard them produced by them, with great confidence in proofe of Reprobation; Therfore I am loath to passe them ouer in silence, without hearing from your selfe, what Constructions you and your party doe giue of them.

The next therefore shallbe that passage, which my Brethren haue in vanting wordes euer much prysed; and therfore I should be the more willing to receaue a sufficient and irreplishable answere therto. The Text is this: (9) *The*

(9) Rom. 9.

Elder

der shall serue the yonger; I loued Iacob, and hated Esau. From which wordes they inferre, that *God* euen from his mothers wombe hated *Esau*, and therefore without regard of his euill workes did reprobate him.

Arminius:

Indeed this is the Maister-peece in all your shopps. But I hope (*Enthus.*) I shallbe able to giue you full satisfaction herein; wherby you may partly resemble this passage to lightning and thunder, which are fearefull to the eye, and do but seldome hurt. And first I say, that if there were no other Answere then this following, yet it were sufficient. We know, that *S. Peter* admonisheth vs, that (r) *in Pauls Epistles are* (r) 2. Pet. 3. *things hard to be vnderstood.* Now, amõg other places of this nature, this passage of Scripture touching *Iacob and Esau*, was euer accounted the most difficult. Heere then I demand, what equity or reason is it, that this one place (being fraught with obscurity and spinosity) should seeme in any mans iudgment, to frustrate and make void so many most cleare, euident, and illustrious Texts

vrged

vrged to the contrary? as where it is
(s) 2. Pet. 3. said: (s) *He would not, that any should perish, but all to repent.* Agayne; (t) *He would*
(t) Ezech. 18. *not the death of him that dieth; but* (u) *that*
(u) Ezech. 33. *he turne from his wayes, and liue*; besydes many other like most expresse Testimonies, hereafter by me to be insisted vpon.

Secondly, I say, that if we admit this hatred of God *to Esau*; yet this his hatred is not to be taken *Positiuely*, but
(x) See Christmannus in his diagraphe Electionis. pag. 78. and Snecanus in his Method. descript. pag. 317. euen as the (x) learned Protestants do explayne, *Negatiuely*, that is to say, for *not to loue*, or *not to haue mercy*: And according to this my construction, we fynd diuers examples in Scripture, suffering the like interpretation, as where it is said: (y) *If any man come to me, and*
(y) Luc. 14. *hate not his Father and Mother &c.* And agayne (besydes diuers such other)
(z) Iohn. 12. (z) *He that hateth his life, shall keepe it &c.* in all which places, the word, *To hate*, or *Hatred*, doth only signify, a *Not louing* of life, & Parents, according to a certaine measure and respect, and not, *a Positiue hostile hatred.*

Thirdly I answere, that suppose, that in the foresaid sentence, *I loued Iacob, and hated Esau*, the word, *Hated*, were

were to be taken, *positiuely*; yet this *Hatred* cannot be vnderstood of *Esau* as he is Gods Creature; for we reade, That, (a) *of those things, which he made, he hated none*: much lesse then *man*, who was made (b) *according to his owne image*: but this *Hatred* is to be vnderstood only of the Sinne of *Esau*, as euen (c) *Beza* acknowledgeth, which Sinne God did foreknow, but did neuer make. Now that Gods foresight and hatred of *Esau* his Sinne (which point this Text only proueth) is not repugnant to *Freewill* in *Esau*, is made cleare aboue, by my former reconciling of *Freewil* with *Gods* foreknowledge, and prouision.

Lastly I reply, that euen according to the iudgements of (d) diuers learned Protestants: and as the contexture of the place sheweth, the first part thereof is taken out of (e) *Genesis*, the second part out of (f) *Malachy*; and therefore, as the context of *Malachy* & other wordes of *Genesis* doe further make euident, the whole sentence aboue alledged touching *Iacob and Esau*, is to be vnderstood only of the seuerall posteritie of *Iacob* and *Esau*: to wit, of the felicity of the one, and the infelicity or calami-

(a) Wisdom. 11.
(b) *Genes.*
(c) *Beza* (a) in his display of Popish practises pag 17. thus saith: *We both confesse, that God condemneth nothing in man but guiltines.*
(d) *Gesnerus in disputat. pro lib. Concord. p. 620. & 622. Christmannus* in his Diagraphe *Electionis &c. 9. p. 72. 73. & 74. Kimodoncus* in his Redemption of man-

ty of the other: vnder which two Posteriities the different states of the *Iewes* & *Gentils* are adūbrated & shadowed. But because the displaying of this point is of it selfe not conducing to our Question in hand, and requireth a farre longer discourse, then the shortnes of this tyme will afford: therefore I purposely forbeare to enlarge my selfe further therin. And thus much now aboue said, concerning your *Gordians knot*, which you, and other of your Brethren thinke to hard to loose and dissolue.

Enthusiastus.

Learned *Arminius*. I feare, that heertofore I did much vnderualue you: & I rest fully satisfied with your great variety of Answeres to the former Authority: and heerafter I shall neuer take it as a conuincing Text for the proofe of *Reprobation*. But now after I haue alledged all the chiefe Texts (as I take it) which seeme immediatly and expresselly to concerne *Reprobation* or damnation, without preuision of workes: there remaine som other behind, which are vrged by diuers, but this by way of inference and deduction only, for the

proofe

proofe of the sayd point of *Reprobation*: which I will propose to you, to receaue your solutions of them. Of which nũber the first sort of Texts seemeth to prooue, that God *hardeneth the hart of of man*, so as he cannot exercise vertue, or obtaine his owne Saluation. As where it is sayd: (f) *God hardened the hart of Pharao*. In like manner, we read: (g) *Therefore they could not beleiue, because as Esay said: He hath blinded their eyes, & hardened their hart.* And more fully: (h) *Why hast thou made vs to erre from thy wayes, and hardened our harts?* And lastly (besides many other like sayings:) (i) *He deliuered them vp into a reprobate sense.*

(f) Exod.
(g) Iohn.
(h) Esay.
(i) Rom.

Arminius.

To these I answere, that God is sayd to harden mans hart, not *positiuely* (to vse the Schoole mens former *Dialect*) but only *Negatiuely*; that is, as (k) *Austin* teacheth, not by giuing malice, but by not affoarding him grace: Since God in respect of mans former sinnes withdraweth his Grace; and through that forbearance of his Grace, mans hart is sayd to be hardned. Thus

(k) Epist. 105. ad Sixtum.

this *Induratio* is not properly *Gods* Act, but only by his permission, but it is mãs owne Act. This Construction is consonant to the Iudgment of the Ancient Fathers: For euen *Caluin* himselfe (as elswhere is sayd) speaking of *Induration*, thus confesseth of the Fathers: (l) *All the Ancient Fathers were afrayd to confesse the truth of this matter: And Austin truly was not free sometimes from this superstition, as where he sayth: that Induration and excecation pertayne not to the working of God, but to his foreknowledge.* Yea which is more, diuers (m) learned Protestants do expound with me this heardning of *Pharao's heart*, to be not the Act of *God*, but only his permission.

Now, that *Gods* Permission should be called his worke, is frequent and obuious in the Scripture; as where *Esay* sayth: (n) *Make the hart of this people fat, and shut their eyes.* Which point in Esay, *S. Iohn* deliuereth in like wordes, saying: (o) *He hath blinded their eyes.* Yet our (p) *Sauiour*, and (q) *S. Paul* alleaging the same saying out of *Esay*, insteed of the former wordes, say only: *They haue blinded their eyes*; so referring this blindnes, to the Act of themselues, and not to

(l) *Instit. l. 2. c. 4. sect. 3.*
(m) Melancthon *in loc. Com. de causa peccati &c.* Cuiteng. Bullinger in his Decades in English *pag. 492. 493.* [illegible] *Polanus in Partition. Theolog. l. 2. pag. 75. 76* Besydes diuers others.
(n) *Esay 6.*
(o) *Iohn 12.*
(p) *Math. 13.*
(q) *Act. 28.*

is the Act of God, but only by permission. In like sort, *God* is said to haue (r) *afflicted Iob*. And yet it is cleare by perusing the History, that *God* only permitted the Diuell to afflict him. Yea which is more, concerning the very Text aboue alleaged touching the *hardening* of *Pharaos heart*; it is els where explayned and expressly said: (s) *That, Pharao did harden his owne heart*.

(r) Iob. 1. & 2.

(s) Exod. 8.

Therefore to conclude this point, *Induration* is not properly the worke of *God*, but only his permission, and forsaking the party for precedent sinnes. Which reason of *Induration* is particularly alleadged by the Prophet in these wordes: (t) *My people would not heare my voyce, and Israel would none of me, so I gaue them vp to the darknes of their Hart*. And thus farre in answere of all such Texts, which do seeme to imply, that God doth *Harden* the *Hart of man*, or deliuer him vp to a *Reprobate sense*.

(t) Psalm. 81.

Enthusiastus.

I take this your solution most sorting to the *Analogy* of Fayth, expressed in other passages of Scripture by you alleaged, as also concordant to the iudg-

ment both of the Ancient Fathers, and diuers learned Protestants. But to proceed further: I haue often heard alledged in proofe of *Reprobation*, that in the betraying of *Christ*, *Iudas* and the other wicked with him, did (as the Text sayth) (u) *What the hand and Councell of God decreed to be*. And further it is said: (x) *Him Chr. being deliuered by the determinate Councell of God, haue you crucified*. These places make ouerture, that *God* euen ordained *Iudas*, and the rest of those consorting Iewes, by the prodition of Christ, to damnation.

(u) Act. 4.
(x) Act. 2.

Arminius.

In full Answere hereto, I must recur to certaine principles in diuinity, acknowledged by all learned (y) Protestants; to wit, that in euery wicked Action, we are to consider (as elswhere is shewed) what is therein *Positiue* or *Materiall*, and to distinguish & separate it from the *malice* or *deformity*, which is in euery said wicked Action. That which is *Materiall* (as hauing in it selfe an *Entity* or *Being*, proceedeth from God, in whom it is said, (z) *We liue and moue*. But the *Malignity* or *deformi-*

(y) Bucanus in loc. Com. lib. pe. pag. 404. Amandus Polanus in Partition. Theolog. l. 1. p. 71. & 72. D. Whit. contra Duraeum. l. 3. pag. 397.
(z) Act. 17.

formity in euery wicked Action, is in it selfe (as being a deuiation from the true vse of Reason) a mere *priuation*, or *defect*, and hath no *Entity* or *being*; and consequently doth not proceede from God; since as (a) *Austin* truly teacheth: *Priuations and defects haue no Efficient, but a deficient Cause:* And therefore such priuations, or defects proceede only from our selues.

(a) L. 12. de Ciuit. Dei. c. 7.

Now to apply this doctrine to the Authority vrged; certaine it is, that the death and Passion of our *Sauiour* was of *God*, for the Redemption of mankind; But the prodition and particular Impiety of *Iudas* and his Complices, in putting our *Sauiour* to death, was of themselues, and not of God, nor his *Councell, will, or causing*, but of their owne malice against *Christ*: Which malice of *Iudas* and the rest, God did foreknow, and suffer, but neuer willed or decreed it. Therefore *Sixtinus* (a learned Protestant) writeth well of these former Texts, thus saying: (b) *The words (Hand and Counsell) signify the good and healthfull End, for which God permitted that wicked fact of the Iewes, which he did neyther assist nor allow.* Thus you see, that

(b) In disputat. Theolog. de prouidentiâ Dei &c. sect. 14.

from the former Texts we cannot collect, that *God* incited or caused *Iudas* to commit that wicked act, but that it being committed through his owne most impious mind and disposition, God by his *Hand, and Counsell*, did turne it to mans good. And thus much touching the *Hand* and *Counsell of God* in the act of Iudas, and his Complices. But proceed further.

Enthusiastus.

What say you (*Arminius*) to that often obiected place: (c) *Lead vs* (*) *not into temptation?* Now these wordes may seeme to import, (or otherwise we should not pray for the preuenting of it) that *God* sometimes leadeth man into temptation of Sinne, & consequētly prepareth the way to his damnation, and the rather seeing these former words make show to import not only a *Permission*, but euen an *Actuall leading into temptation.*

(c) *Math.*

(*) Obiected by D Fulke against the *Rhem. Test. in Math. c. 6.*

Arminius.

The answere to this place is implicitly and potentially included in the Answere aboue giuen, touching Indu-

ration

ration of *Pharao* aboue obiected, and therefore the true sense of these words is: *Suffer vs not to be led into temptation of Sinne, by withdrawing thy grace from vs.* Which exposition is most sorting to other passages of Scripture, as where it is said: (d) *Not suffering vs to be tempted aboue our power; but with the temptation maketh way to escape, that we may be able to beare it.* In like sort *S. Iames* sayth: (e) *Let no man, when he is tempted, say, that he is tempted of God, for God is not a tempter of euill; And he hath tempted no man, but euery one is tempted of his owne Concupiscence &c.* But goe on (*Enthusiastus.*)

(d) 1. Cor. 10.

(e) Iames 1.

Enthusiastus.

I proceed further. I haue read some of ours to vrge these Texts following: (f) *I forme the light, and create darknes, I make peace, and create Euill.* Agayne, it is thus written: (g) *Shall there be any Euill in the City, which the Lord hath not done?* Where, by *creating darknes*, may be vnderstoode, to create man to eternall darknes.

(f) Esay 45.

(g) Amos 7.

Arminius.

In answere. To these Texts you may

(h) Decad. pag. 491.
(i) In Method. Theolog. p. 438.
(k) In volum. 1. Thesium Theolog. p. 175. 176. & seqq.

concearne, that (h) *Bullinger*, and (i) *Hyperius* (two eminent Protestants) doe teach euen out of *Austin*, that they are to be vnderstood, *De malo pœnæ, non de malo culpæ*; That is, *Of the euill of punishment, not of the euill of Sinne*: to whose iudgement (k) *Piscator* also (no vulgar Protestant) subscribeth. The exposition giuen by the former Protestants and me, of these said places is so allowed by the iudgments of other of our owne Brethren, that euen the same places are so commented in the Marginall Annotations of the English Translation of the Bibles of the yeare 1576. So as there shall not be any neede to answere more touching the same. But yet let vs heare of some more of your obiected Texts.

Enthusiastus.

I doe assure you, I am wearyed, (and I thinke also I haue wearyed you) in these my allegations; and the rather, seeing I fynd them all so probably (to speake the least) if not fully, answered by you.

Therefore I will conclude this my *Scene* of obiecting with alledging these

Texts

Texts following; As how it is said; that (l) *God caused* * *David to number the People*. That, (n) *God commanded Semei to curse David*; And (o) appointed *Satan to be a false Spirit in the mouth of Ahabs Prophets*: Besydes many other passages of like nature. Now these and the like Texts do seeme in diuers of our Brethrens Iudgments to prooue, that *God* would not cause these actions in men, which are *predestinated* to Saluation, but only in the *Reprobate*.

(l) 2. Samuel 24.
(n) 2. Samuel 16.
(o) 1. Regum. 22.
(*) Obiected by *Caluin. in Instit. l. 2. c. 18.*

Arminius.

Heere againe (as in some of the former I haue done) I will interpose the iudgements of diuers learned Protestants (as a shield) betweene the former Texts and me; yet before I come to their expresse Testimonies therein, I must aduertise you (*Enthusiastus*) of two things: The first is, that many things, which are done only by the permission of *God*, himself (according to the phrase and *Dialect* of the Scripture) is sayd to doe; as aboue I noted touching *Pharaos induration*.

Secondly, you may be aduertised, that when *God* suffereth man to do any thing

thing to this or that particuler end; God (by the like forme of speach in Scripture) is sayd to cause or command the doing of it, as is elswhere noted. Now to apply these two obseruations to the former passages of Scripture: And as touching *God* commanding *Dauid* to number the People; it is explayned elswhere in expresse wordes, that (p) *Satan prouoked Dauid to number them*; So euident it is, that the numbering of the People was the worke of *Satan* persuading thereto, and not the worke of *God*, but only by his permission; & according to this my Answere, the Marginall notes of the English Bibles of anno 1576. vpon this place do thus comment: *The Lord permitted Satan &c.* And to this our expositiō *Austin* accordeth touching *Semei* in these wordes: (q) *Quomodo dixerit Dominus Semei maledicere Dauid &c. How the Lord spake to Semei to curse Dauid &c. this is to be vnderstood, non iubendo, not by commanding Semei &c. For if Semei had obeyed the Lord commanding him, then there were reason, why he should be rather prayssed, then punished.*

(p) 1. Chro. 21.

(q) L. de gra. & libero arbitrio. c. 20.

In like sort, *Iohn Knox* speaking of the Tyranny of *Pharao*, and the cursing

ursing of *Semei*, thus writeth (r) *Neither to Pharao, neither to Semei, nor to any other reprobate doth God giue eyther wicked commandement, or euill thoughts*. The truth of which Answere God himselfe (making mention of the sinnefull actions of the *People*) may seeme to seale vp in these his words (s) *I commãded it not, nor spake it; neyther came it into my mynd*. So much are we deceaued in dreaming, that God should eyther command, or cause sinne.

(r) Against the Aduersaries of Gods predestination. p. 374.

(s) Hier. 19.

But *Enthusiastus*, before I end this passage I would demand of you the reason, (as aboue I did) why your party do alledg these last Texts, and some others aboue obiected by you; to wit, touching Gods leading vs into Temptation, touching the Induration *of Pharaos* hart, touching Iudas his prodition of our Sauiour &c? Yf they be alledged by your syde, to proue that *God* is the cause and procurer of those sinfull Acts, tending to mans *Reprobation*, (as it seemes they are to that end alledged;) how then can you and yours exclude *God* (as afore I vrged, touching some Texts aboue insisted by you) from being *Author of Sinne*, a confessed blas-

blasphemy, and for such confessed by (t) *D. Whitakers*, (u) *D. Fulke*, and other most learned Protestants? Yf the aforesayd passages be not produced to the former end, then they in no sort touch the doctrine of *Reprobation*.

(t) Contra Duraeum, l. 8. p. 514.
(u) In his defence of the English Translation pag. 500.

Enthusiastus.

I grant *Arminius*, I cannot sufficiently to my owne satisfaction reply thereto: and to speake more fully, I confesse the consideration of this your so seeming necessary inference, hath oftentymes strongly assaulted my iudgement to give assent, that God is the *Author of Sinne*. Yea which is more, I haue often insisted in this cōsequence to many learned men of my syde: not any of them would euer yield in expresse wordes, that *God* was the *Author of Sinne*: But when vpon such their wordes I replyed, how then can *God* be said to obdurate *Pharao's* hart; to lead vs into temptation; to cause *Semei* to curse *Dauid*; and to cause or procure infallibly these and the like other wicked Actions, specified in many of the former Texts, commonly alledged for proofe of *Reprobation*; and yet that not-

notwithstanding all this, it should not follow, that *God* were the *Authour of Sinne*? They (I well remember) would answere this my propounded difficulty seuerall wayes, whose Answeres I will at this present relate to you, to know how far the said Answeres in your leuell do carry: or whether in your iudgment, they are satisfactory to take away your former dangerous illation.

Some prime men do first answere, That, (x) *Whatsoeuer God doth, is good: He doth all thinges; all thinges therefore are good, as they be done of him: And the difference of good or euill hath place only in the instruments*. And thus they teach, that such Actions, which are in man wicked, are notwithstanding in *God* most iust and good. Others agayne would secondly salue the matter in this sort: (y) *We answere, God hauing no Superiour, can haue no law prescribed to him; And Sinne hath only place, where there is a law: from whence it followeth, that in the Actions of God, there is no Sinne*. Others agayne shape a third solution, (so irresolute I did fynd them in their Answeres) by distinguishing, that (z) in euery sinfull Action, what is *Positiue* &

(x) *Beza* in his display of Popery. pag. 111.

(y) *Aretius in Loc. Com. pag. 130. & Swingl. tom. 1. de prouidentia Dei. c. 6. fol. 365.*

(z) D. Whitak. contr. Duraeum. vbi supra. l. 8. p. 527. *Bucanus in loc. Comm. loc. 36. pag. 404.*

Ma-

Materiall is euer of *God*: but say they (I aboue is touched) the *deformity*, and *defect*, which is in euery such action, is not of *God*, but of our selues.

Arminius.

All this your diuersity of Answeres solue not the difficulty aboue propounded: but they are meer tergiuersations and subtill euasions of the point handled. And to beginne with this your last Answere: if your compartners did meane nothing els, but that which *is materiall* in a sinfull action is of *God*, and the *defect*, *priuation*, and impiety in each such action doth proceed from man: then were the difficulty solued, and the controuersy at an end: but diuers of your friends are so full gorged in their sentences, of God being the sole causer of our wicked actions, as that the said sentences are not capable of this solution: for we fynd some of them thus to write: (a) *When we commit adultery, or murther, it is the worke of God, being the mouer, the Author, and inciter.*

Heere you see, that not only what is *materiall* in these actions, but also the

prauity

ranity and *deformity* in them, is ascribed to *God*, as the Authour thereof. And agayne: (b) *The Theefe, coactus est ad peccandum, is forced to sinne:* And another sayth: (c) *God exciteth the wicked will of one Theefe to kill another.* Where you see againe, that the *wickednes* of the *Will* is attributed to *God*. And a third sayth (to omit diuers others) that, (d) *Our sinnes are not only by Gods permission, but by his decree and will:* He so attributing both what is *Materiall*, and the *Deformity* in euery Sinne, to the decree and *will of God*, and consequently maketh *God* the Authour thereof.

(b) *Swingl. vbi supra.*

(c) *Beza* in his foresaid display. *pag.* 202.

(d) *Calu. Instit. l.* 1. *c.* 18. *sect.* 2.

Add hereto, That whereas diuers of our Aduersaries do maintayne, that (to deliuer it in their owne words) (*) *What soeuer thing God doth foresee, the same he doth will, decree, and ordayne to be done*, so confounding his foreknowledge and prescience with his Predestination and Decree (a point aboue refuted.) Now, I conclude from these mens doctrine, that *God* is the Authour aswell of the *Deformity*, and Sinne in euery wicked action, as of what is *Materiall* and *Positiue* therin, seeing he aswell foreknoweth the one, as the other.

(*) *Calu. l.* 3. *c.* 23. *sect.* 6. And by M. Perkins in his Treatise of Gods free grace. *pag.* 148.

Now touching the other two manners of reconciling the former difficulty; if so we but truly consider, what is the touch of the point herein, the force of those Answeres will instantly (like a clowd before the Sunne) vanish away: Since those euasions shew, That *God* is not Authour of Sinne, in himselfe (which all men freely grant) but they proue not, that *God* is not the *Authour of Sinne* in vs (for this they touch not at all) which is the difficulty only heere to be salued, and in which the Controuersy consisteth.

But I will conclude this point, and to shew, how inexplicable (or rather contradictory) in it selfe it is, to maintaine that *God* forceth & causeth Sinne in man, and yet is not the Authour thereof, *Caluin* shall speake for me, who is constrayned thus to acknowledge hereof. (e) *How God is not to be drawne into the fellowship of fault, as being the Authour or allower of Transgression, let vs not be ashamed to confesse our ignorance, seeing it is playne, that it is a secret far aboue mans vnderstanding.*

(e) *De aeterna Dei prædest. contra Pighium, pag. 218.*

And now hauing spoken, what I should conuenient to be said, touching this

his foule aspersion, of *God* being the *Author of Sinne*, how truly or untruly urged against some of our owne Brethren the Protestants, I leave to other mens indifferency and impartiality to censure; I would, *Enthusiastus*, know, whether you have finished your discourse in your objections, or that you will draw other Arguments eyther frō the Authority of the Ancient Doctours of Christs his Church, or from any other Head of proofes? For I am loath to encircle and confine your liberty within a lesser compasse, then your selfe would desire.

Enthusiastus.

Indeed *Arminius* it may be, that I could produce some appearing Arguments eyther from reason, or Authority of the Primitive Doctours, which in an vndiscerning eye might at the first perhaps seeme of some force; but seeing I cannot fynd any one Text in Gods Holy word, to fortify the doctrine of *Reprobation* (if your former Answeres to them be true and solid) therfore I must needs conclude, that all such other Arguments, which might be

produced, would be more easily solued, then those former drawne from Holy Writ. In respect whereof, I heer desist from further obiecting, the burden of which labour is passed vpon you.

Arminius.

I accept of the paines most willingly, and in performance of this taske, I will still perseuere in my former method of rising vp by degrees to the Holy Scripture. Therefore my first Head of Authorities is taken, from the Protestants themselues (men of great eminency for learning) who vpon their second and more serious reuiew, with a great auersion of iudgment do wholy disauow and reiect the Doctrine of *Reprobation*, as most iniurious to Gods Honour and Mercy.

The Protestants in so great a number, are so full in this poynt, that first for orders sake, I will alledge the *Caluinists*, then the *Lutherans* conspiring with vs in this doctrine. And as touching the *Caluinists*, I will begin *Enthusiastus* with the *Caluinists of England*, your Countrymen. First I alleadge *M. Fox* thus writing: (f) *Seeing the benefit of*

(f) *In Apocalyps. pag.* 473.

Re-

Redemption, which taketh away the Sinnes of the world, is an vniuersall thing; it is demanded, whether the grace of this Redemption, do appertayne equally to all the posterity of Adam, or be restrayned to a certaine number? I answere, that the incredulity of men, and no default of the Lambe maketh this restraint. Thus *M. Fox.*

D. Couell thus teacheth; (g) *Surely God hath a generall inclination to saue all &c. And that with a conditionall Will, he willeth all men to be saued, who therefore that they are not saued, is not his decree, but their owne fault. M. Hooker* is no lesse strong in this doctrine, saying: (h) *Gods generall inclination is, that all men might be saued. M. Gibbons* discourseth thereof in this sort: (i) *Surely, there was no cause in God, either in his will, or in his knowledge or decree, that man should fall.*

That the doctrine of *Vniuersality of Grace*, which importeth, that God afforderth to euery man sufficient Grace for his owne Saluation) is entertayned by diuers worthy men of your owne Nation (*Enthusiastus*) is so euident, that *D. Willet* taketh notice, & complaineth thereof in this manner: (k) *Vniuersality of grace seemeth much to be approued by*

(g) In his defence of M. Hooker. p. 62. & 63.

(h) In his *Ecclesiast. Policy.* p. 104.

(i) M. Gibb. in his *quest. & disputat.* vpon *Genes. quæst.* 2. pag. 108.

(k) D. Willet in his Synops. pa. 784.

our olde Country men, and hath already gotten some Patrones in our Church.

But to come to the iudgment of the learned *Caluinists* of other Countries: *Heminginus* (that learned *Caluinist*) discourseth of *Reprobation*, maintayned by his Aduersaries in this full manner (l) *Pugnat cum verbo Dei vocanti &c. That Doctrine fighteth with the Word of God, calling and inuiting all men to repentance: It maketh men partly sluggish, partly secure, and partly desperate; For many are driuen to despayre, whiles by this opinion is euen throwne the doctrine of Vniuersall Grace, in which all are commanded by faith to include themselues. For if we respect the Cause, which is the Mercy of God in Christ, Grace is truly Vniuersall: But if we respect the euent, which dependeth vpon the faults of man, it is particular.* Thus largly he disputeth hereof.

(l) Heming. lib. de vniuersali gratia. pag. 348.

(m) Vpon the Reuelat. englished cap 5. fol. 79.

(n) In his Decades in English. pag. 492. 493. 494.

Bullinger as fully intreateth of this point, saying: (m) *The Lord dyed for all, but that all men are not made partakers of this Redemption, is through their own fault; for the Lord excludeth no man.* Yea *Bullinger* is so absolute in this doctrine, as that he vndertaketh to explayne the (n) *Induration of Pharaes heart*, & diuers

lyke Texts of Scripture, produced agaynst this our doctrine. But to proceed further: *Amãdus Polanus* thus teacheth: (o) *God by his conditionall will would haue all men saued.* And further: (p) *God doth not cause, but permit men to fall into Sinne.* And yet more: (q) *God is not the cause of all thinges, that he foreseeth.* To conclude, *Piscator* is so great a Patrone of our doctrine, as that he (r) alleageth diuers Scriptures for the fortifying of his owne Opinion therein; as also answereth diuers Texts of Scripture, obiected by our Aduersaries.

Now touching the *Lutheranes*, We fynd, that (s) *Kempnitius*, (t) *Iacobus Andraas*, (u) *Conradus Schlussenburg*, (x) *Gesnerus*, *the* (y) *Century Writers*, *The* (z) *Confession of Auspurg*, (a) *Manlius*, (b) *Wigandus*, (c) *Lobechius*, (d) *Sarcerius*, (e) *Adamus Francisci*, and (to omit many others) euen the learned *Melancthon*, to conspire with vs herein. Which *Melancthon*, though for a tyme he was deuoted to the contrary doctrine, yet in his later dayes he wholy disauowed his said doctrine, and agreeth with the former *Lutheranes* therein: For thus he writeth: (f) *Falsa & detestanda accusatio*

(o) *Amandus Polanus, in partition. Theolog. p.* 11. 12.
(p) *Ibid. p.* 8.
(q) *Ibid. p.* 76.
(r) *Volum.* 1. *Thes. Theolog. pag.* 174. 175.
(s) *In Enchirid. p.* 158.
(t) *In Respons. Bez. ad Colloq. Montisbelg. part. altera. pag.* 951.
(u) *In Theolog. Calu. l.* 1. *Art.* 12.
(x) *In disput. pre lib. Concord. pag.* 60. 61. 62.
(y) *Cent.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 4. *Col.* 348.
(z) In the

est &c. That accusation is false, and to be detested, which sayth: God sinneth not, though he helpeth the wicked to perpetrate their impietyes, because (say some men) God being aboue the Law, it is lawfull for him to do, what he pleaseth. And then further: *O tetram vocem &c. O bad saying! For neyther God willeth at any tyme, nor causeth any workes, contradicting and repugnant to his Law.*

And agayne: (g) *Addunt & hoc argumentum &c. The foresaid men doe adioyne this argument:* To wit: *All things are done, God seeing and determining them &c. But let vs perseuere euer in this sentence or opinion, that God neither willeth, nor affecteth, nor approueth Sinne.* Thus far of the Protestants iudgments in this point; omitting for the auoyding of prolixity the like Authorities of many other Protestants of Eminency: Of whom some do call this doctrine of our Aduersaries, (h) *Hurtfull to manners.* Others, (i) *Wicked.* Agayne, Others, (k) *Blasphemous.* And finally, Others, (l) *Horrendum dogma, & horrendum auditu.*

Enthusiastus.

I had little thought, before this instant,

Harm. of the Confess. in English. pag. 268. 269.
(a) In loc. Com. p. 140.
(b) In Syntagm. ex Nou. Testam. Col. 109. 110 & 111.
(c) In disput. Theolog. disput. 1. p. 24. & disput. 21. p. 307.
(d) In loc. Com. tom. 1. de praedest. fol. 29. 31. 32.
(e) In Margarit. Theolog. pag. 204.
(f) In Concil. Theolog. part. 2. p. 111.
(g) Vbi supra. pag. 113.

nt, that so great a troope of learned otestants, had with such an vnanmous consent maintayned, this your octrine. But I see, your allegations of em are so precise and punctuall, that force I must giue way thereto. But et me intreate you to proceed to o- her proofes.

Arminius.

In this next place I come to the athers. Whose iudgment herein is a- oue discouered, touching their iudg- ment in the doctrine of *Free will*: seeing as is aboue often said) the doctrine of *Reprobation*, or *Predestination* is inclu- ded, or rather impugned, in the do ctrine of *Free will*. But to take a little ast or delibation of some Fathers par- ticular sayings: Thus we fynde *Austin* to write: (m) *Detestanda &c. It is a hate- full and abominable opinion to beleeue, that God is the authour of any euill wil, or action.* *Vincentius Lyrinensis* thus fully writeth hereof: (n) *Who before Nouatianus taught, that God would rather the death of him that dieth, then that he should returne and liue?* Which Father also further sayth: (o) *Who before Simon Magus &c. was*

(h) *Melanct. in loc. Com. de causa peccati.*
(i) *Christ- mannus in Dia- graphe Elect. pag. 94.*
(k) *Rungius in disput. quindecim ex epist. Pauli ad Corinth. posteriorē disput. 14.*
(l) *Andræas. in epitom. Colloq. Mompelg. pag. 54.*
(m) *Aug- stin. ad Articul. sibi falso impositi. Art. 10.*
(n) *L. aduers. Hæ- res. post medium.*
(o) *Vin-*

bold to affirme, God the Creatour, to be the Authour of our wicked deeds? Thus you see, these doctrines (to no small blemish of them) take their beginning from *Simon Magus*, and the Hereticke *Nouatianus*.

cont. Eyrin. vbi supra.

But this point of further producing particular Testimonies of the Fathers, wilbe not much needfull; seeing the learned Protestants (our Aduersaries in this doctrine) confesse fully thereof: For (p) one of thē taxeth & reprehendeth *Chrysostome, Cyrill, Origen*, & others for their different doctrine to them touching Reprobation. And another thus in expresse wordes confesseth heereof: (an acknowledgment aboue alledged) (q) *Veteres omnes &c. All the Auncient Fathers were afrayd to confesse the truth in this matter; And Austin truly was not free from this superstitiō; as where he saith, that Induration and Execation pertaine not to the working of God, but to his forknowledge.* Thus much for greater breuity, touching the Ancient Fathers heerein.

(p) Beza, in his display, &c. pag. 137.

(q) Caluinstit. l. 2. c. 4. sect. 3.

Enthusiastus.

You may then rise to your other proofes; for these your former Authorities

rities taken from the Protestants, and the Fathers thus farre most euidently carry; that is, that both the Protestats and the Fathers (next aboue by you alledged) do agree with you in doctrine, touching *Reprobation*.

Arminius.

(o) Well before I arriue vp to the Holy *Scriptures*, I will touch a litle vpon the auncient *Iewes*, who as afore teaching the Freedome of mans will, must therein (as is aboue often inculcated) necessarily teach our doctrine of *Vniuersality of Grace*, and the impugning of *Reprobation*; but how farre the *Iewish Rabbins* are engaged in this our doctrine, it will easily appeare from the acknowledgements of (r) *Munster* and (s) *Peter Martyr*; both which confesse, that those *Rabbins* did ascribe the induration and hardning of *Pharaos* heart only to Gods permission, and not as to his proper act or worke.

(r) *In Annot. in Exodic 7.*
(s) *In Epist. ad Romanos. c. 9.*

Now, in regard of these two eminent Protestants confessions in this poynt, it will be lesse needfull to insist in the particular Authorities of the said *Iewes*; but I will content my selfe with the

the alledging only of *Philo* (that most learned and graue *Iew*) his words. Thus then *Philo* writeth: (t) *Ipsi enim patrem &c.* It was not conuenient (or seeming) that the powerfull God should prepare in the rationall Soule the way to vice &c. Therefore it remayneth to be considered, that God is the cause only of good, but not of any Euill. And againe he thus further discourseth: (u) *Therefore let no wicked act, being perpetrated by affected diligence of man, be reputed or said to proceede from the sentence of God, but from our owne proper will.* And thus briefly touching the iudgment of the *Iewes* in this Controuersy.

(t) In lib. de confusione linguarum.

(u) Lib. de Profugis.

Enthusiastus.

Well *Arminius*. You haue ruetted the truth of your doctrine herein by many humane Testimonies, the which I greatly presume are not capable of any sufficient Reply, admitting the said Testimonies to be sortable to the word of God. Therefore I much couet, that you hasten to your Scripturall proofes, since they are to preponderate all other kinds of proofes whatsoeuer.

Arminius.

Now I come to them; and as I said afore of humane Authorities aboue alledged, in confirmation of *Freewill*, that they did consequently impugne our aduersaries doctrine touching *Reprobation*: so with much more reason may I say, that al the former diuine passages heertofore produced, to maintaine the doctrine of *Freewill*, do by necessary inference & deduction ouerthrow the aduersaries sayd doctrine of *Reprobation*. Therefore passing ouer all such former diuine Authorities touching *Freewill*: I will heer insist in such Texts of Scripture, as do immediatly and expresly impugne this your doctrine of *Reprobation*.

And first, I will insist in those Texts, which teach, that *God* would haue all men saued. That done I will defend to such passages, which shew, that *God* was incarnated and suffered death for the saluing of All mankind. And to beginne with the first sort of proofes. The Prophet *Ezechiel* in most full manner, and in seuerall places confesseth the truth heereof, thus saying: (x) *Haue I*

(x) Ezech. 18.

any

any desire, that the wicked should die, saith the Lord? Againe. (y) Cast away from you all your Transgressions &c. for I desire not the death of him, that dyeth. Yea God by this Prophet deposeth (as it were) his intention heerein, with a most vehement ingemination in these words: (z) As I live, saith the Lord God, I desire not the death of the wicked: but that the wicked turne from his wayes, & live. Turne you, turne you from your evill wayes: for why will you die, O yee house of Israel? Againe (to leave this Prophet) do we not find the Prophet Isay to write in the like Dialect (a) a Text above alledged, saying in the person of God? (c) Iudge I pray you betweene my Vine & me, what more could I have done for it, that I have not done? Wherefore then hath it given thornes, and I looked for grapes? In lyke sort the Euangelist (to shew that nothing is wanting on Gods syde for mans saluation) thus speaketh of Iezabel: (b) I gave her a time, that she might repent, and she will not repent. And to this end it is sayd (I meane, that men by leaning their sinnes, might purchase saluation) by the former Euangelist, that (c) God standeth at the doore (viz of our

(y) Ezech. 18. supra.

(z) Ezech. 33.

(a) Isa. 5.

(b) Reuelat. 2.

(c) Reuelat. 3.

of our harts) *and knocks; if any will open, he will enter into him, and supp with him.* And therefore in respect of *Gods* proceeding herein, it is no wonder, that *S. Peter* speaketh thus of all men in generall: (d) *God is not willing, that any perish, but that all returne to repentance.*

(d) 2. Petr. 3. and see 1. Tim. 2. 4.

Now to come to the second kind of Texts, which shew, that the end of Gods Incarnation and Passion, was the salvation of All men, for unto here to we read: That, (e) *God tooke away the sinnes of the World*; (f) *That, He was a Saviour of the World*; That, (g) *He gave himselfe a Redemption for All*; That (h) *He tasted death for All.* Finally, that (i) *He was a reconciliation for our Sinnes, and not for ours only, but also for the Sinnes of the whole World.* Now whither tend all these most forcing (and indeed most comfortable) passages of Scripture, but to proue, that *God* for his part createth not any man to damnation, but would haue all men saued; and that for the accomplishing of the same end (if so sinners themselues would) he became incarnated, and suffred death?

(e) Iohn. 1. 29. (f) Iohn. 4. 42. (g) 1. Tim. 2. 6. (h) Hebr. 2. 9. (i) 1. Iohn. 2. 2.

And that no man shall thinke, that Christ died only for the Elect (and accor-

accordingly shall restraine (as some of your syde do) the former Texts touching Christs death for man, only to the *Elect*; marke what the Scripture for the fuller explanation, deliuers of this point. For it thus sayth: (k) *The weake brother shall perish, for whom Christ hath died.* And agayne: (l) *Christ is the Sauiour of All men, especially of the faythfull.* And yet more, speaking of wicked men: (m) *They deny him, who bought them; the Lord bringing vpon them speedy damnation.* Ye also: (n) *The Angell of his presence saued them, and in his mercy he redeemed Them &c. But they rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit; and therefore he was turned to be their Enemy.* And lastly we thus read of the Wicked: (o) *Who hath troden the Sonne of God vnder foote, and esteemed the bloud of the Testament polluted, wherein he is sanctified, and hath done contumely to the Spirit of Grace.* Ye then the Wicked is *sanctifyed in the bloud of the Testament*, then *the bloud of the Testament* was shed for the Wicked.

(k) 1. Cor. 8. & Rom. 14.
(l) 1. Tim. 4.
(m) 2. Pet. 2.
(n) Esay. 63.
(o) Heb. 10.

Thus you see (*Enthusiastus*) how all these passages of Scripture do assure vs, that Christs passion was vndertaken not only for the *Elect*, but also for the Wicked;

wicked; if so the wicked will not through their continuance in their sinnes, depriue themselues of the benefit thereof; and consequently, that God doth not out of his absolute decree *Reprobate* any man to damnation.

Enthusiastus.

Worthy *Arminius*. I will not forbeare to relate, what I haue heard answered (or rather obiected) by some of our owne learned Brethren to most of these Texts, touching Gods will to haue all men saued. They haue shaped a double Answere hereto. First, they demand, (*) how commeth it to passe, that if so God would haue all men saued, why then are not all men saued, since it is said of God: (p) *He doth, whatsoeuer he will?*

Secondly, my Brethren do answere to the former Testimonies by distinguishing of the will of God. For they teach, that God hath a double Will, (q) *The one* (say they) *secret, fearefull, and vnsearcheable; the other, the reuealed Will of God in his Word*: They vpon this distinction further teaching: That, (r) *God willeth not the death of a Sinner in his*

(*) So vrged by *Kimmedoncius* in his *Redemption of Mankinde* p. 162.

(p) *Psalm.* 115.

(q) So teacheth *Beza* in his display of Popish *&c. p.* 186. 190. 191. *Danæus in Isagoge Christiana part.* 4. *l.* 3. *c.* 38. And *Kimedoncius* in his Redemption of Mankind englished. *pag.* 170 & 182.

(r) *Kimedoncius ubi supra.*

Will reuealed in his Word, but willeth it in his vnsearchable Will. And in proofe of this double kind of Will in God, a learned man on our syde alledgeth these two seeming different sentences: (t) *Ego Deus, creans malum*, And: *Non Deus volens iniquitatem Tu es*, Thus from hence inferring: (s) *How shall these places be reconciled to speake one truth, vnles we make a difference betweene the secret and reuealed Will of God?*

(t) Esay. 45.

(s) M. Willet in his Synops pag. 750.

Agayne, some others in proofe that God hath both a reuealed Will in the Word, and a secret Will also different from the former, do obiect, that Gods *reuealed Will by his word* was, that *Abraham* should offer his Sonne vpon the Mountayne, where he had by his *Secret Will* disposed and determined otherwise. I confesse (*Arminius*) that I doe not much rest vpon these Answeres of my owne Brethren, in regard of the perspicuity of so many places of Scripture already alledged by you to the contrary: Notwithstanding I haue propounded them to you, to know what replies best sort to frustrate, and take away these their said Answeres.

Armi-

Arminius.

Enthusiastus believe me, They are no Answeres, but subtile declynings of the former Texts. Therefore touching these supposed Answeres, I will satisfy you according to my best endeauour. And first, as touching your demand, *How chanceth it, that All-men are not saued, if so God would haue all men saued?* To this I answere in the wordes of the learned Protestants themselues, who thus write: (t) *Voluntas Dei, est vel absoluta, vel conditionalis &c. The Will of God is either absolute, or conditionall.* Now what *God* willeth absolutely, that euer hath its infallible euent. But touching things willed by God *Conditionally*, thus the said men do further teach: *The Conditionall Will of God is that, by the which God willeth some things*, but with an annexed Condition &c. By this his *Conditionall Will*, God would haue All men saued &c. *Nimirum, si promissionibus &c. But with this Condition, if so they believe and obey the promises and preaching of the Gospell.* And then after, the former Protestant sayth of this *Conditionall Will* of God: *At nequaquam est simulata &c.*

(t) *Amandus Polanus in partic. Theolog. l. 1. pag. 10. And Piscator in Volum. 1. Thes. Theologa. p. 174. Musculus in loc. Com. Loc. de Voluntate Dei. p. 415. Hiperius in Method. Theolog. l. 1 p. 156. Hemingius lib. de Vniuersali Gratia. pag. 16.*

All which Protestants do teach, that according to the former distinction, God willeth some things

absolutely, and other things but Conditionally.

But this Conditionall Will is not counterfeyte in God, as if God commanded many things, which indeed he would not. Thus far the former learned Protestant.

To these former Protestants D. Carel thus subscribes in these wordes: (u) *With a Conditionall Will, God willeth All men to be saued, therefore that they are not, is not his decree, but their fault*: he therby meaning, because the Wicked will not answere to Gods Inspirations, not keepe his Commandements, and such like. Thus you haue your first Answere refuted from the learned Protestants owne pens: Whose doctrine herein is warranted from many passages of Scripture, signifying Gods Conditionall Will, as where it is said: (as aboue is touched.) (x) *If any man will heare his voyce, and open the gate, he will supp with him.* And in like sort: (y) *The wicked shall liue, if he will turne from his wayes*, besides many other such sentences in Holy Scripture: in which God doth not compell or inforce our Wils, but affoardeth to vs *Condition of* (z) *Choyce*, and (a) *will not suffer vs to be tempted aboue that, which we are able to beare.* Thus though thinges haue not euer their euent, accor-

(u) In his defence of M. Hooker pag. 621. 623.

(x) Reuel. 3.

(y) Ezech. 18.

(z) Deut. 30.

(a) 1. Cor. 10.

ding

ding to Gods *Conditionall Will*, the cause hereof is not God, but our selues not answering to his *Conditionall Will*. Of which slackes in man, God himselfe complayneth, saying: (b) *I would haue cleansed thee, and thou art not cleane.* And (b) Ezech. 24.

againe; (c) *I called, but you would not answere, but did chuse the things, which I would not.* And finally (to omit diuers (c) Isa. 65.

others) (d) *How often would I gather &c. and thou wouldst not?* Thus far in dis- (d) Matth. 23.

uouall of your first Answere to my former Authorities.

Enthusiasmus.

I well see the weakenes of that first euasion; therefore I pray deliuer your iudgement touching the second Answere, consisting of the *Secret Will* of God, and of his *Reuealed Will* in the Word.

Arminius.

Touching this distinction of Gods will, I hould it to be a meere Phantasme, or *Platonicall Idea*, forged only in despaire of better satisfaction. Therefore I first answere, that if we doe admit God to haue two meere contrary

wills, and this truly and really; by the One of which Wills (to wit, his *Reuealed Will*) he seriously willeth the Conuersion of a Sinner; by his other *Secret Will*, He would not haue him to conuert from Sinne, that therby he may be damned; then it followeth that God at one and the same time willeth meer contrary things; which to imagine God to doe, is both impossible and absurd. And if our Aduersaries (to disintagle themselues out of this net) do say, that God by his *Reuealed Will*, willeth not indeed and seriously the conuersion of a Sinner; but only maketh an outward shew thereof, by exhortation and promise set downe in his word, whereas indeed he willeth and determineth the contrary by his *Secret Will*; doth it not from hence then follow, that God is to be charged rather with *a reuealed dissimulation*, then with *a reuealed Will*?

Secondly I answere, That this distinction of Gods *reuealed* and *concealed will*, fighteth mainly with this One Principle of Protestancy; to wit, that *we are to believe nothing, as matter of faith, but what draweth its proofe from Scripture*. How then can we believe, that God hath

ith a *Secret will*, different from his *reuealed will* in Scripture? Or if they y, that they picke his *Secret will* out of he Scripture, then how can they ter- e it his *Secret Will*, seeing it is expref- d in Scripture? And thus the it would llow, that God should haue Two eer contrary and repugnant Wills, th being expreſſed in Scripture: the hich to aſcribe to his diuine Maieſty, moſt iniurious and diſhonourable; a moſt abſurd, and implying in it ſelf manifeſt contradiction, and conſe- uently thereby weakening the Autho- ity of the ſayd diuine Scripture.

But to proceed further, obſerue *Enthuſiaſtus* the exorbitancy of our ad- erſaries proceeding heerin: for if God would not the death of a Sinner by his *reuealed will* in the Scripture, why then do they vrge from his ſayd word, that He willeth the death of a Sinner, *as of Eſau, Pharao* &c. Now to come to thoſe former places of Scripture, which our Aduerſaries make their *Baſis*, vpon which they build this Intentionall and ery diſtinction of *Gods Secret will*, and is *Reuealed will*: to wit: (e) *Ego Deus reans malum*, and agayne: *Non Deus vo-*

volens iniquitatem tu es: I here answere, That this firster Text is wholy misconstrued, and wrested from its true sense: seeing, *by Euill*, in that place of *Esay*, is vnderstood not Iniquity or the *Euill of Sinne*, but only the *Euill of punishment*, (as is aboue expressed) as namely Warr and Aduersity; as appeareth more euidently by the opposition of the word *Peace*, next precedent. For the words in *Esay* are: *I make peace, and create euill*; And therefore *Hyperius* (the learned Protestant) thus commenteth vpon this place: (f) *Malum pro bello accipitur, vtpote quod paci sit oppositum*: A point so euident, that the English Bibles themselues of the yeare 1576. (as aboue I declared) in their Marginall notes of this place, doe thus paraphrase the foresaid place in Esay: *I send peace and warre, prosperity and aduersity*.

(f) In method. Theolog. lib. 2. pag. 435.

Now, touching the Example of *Abraham*; First I answere, That the Text it selfe sheweth, that Gods euen *Reuealed Will* to *Abraham*, signified by the Angell (and not his *Secret Will*) was, that *Abraham* should not offer (or, as the Text sayth) (g) *Lay his hand vpon the child*. Againe, God only commanded

(g) Genes. 22.

ded *Abraham* to offer his ſonne (as the Text ſayth) to (h) *proue Abraham*. Therefore Gods *Reuealed will* was not to haue it done, but only to haue it commaded for the triall of *Abraham*.

(h) *Gemſ. vbi ſupra.*

Secondly, admitting that it had beene Gods *Reuealed Will*, that *Abraham* ſhould offer his Child, and that this his Will ſhould not haue beene countermanded by his ſaid *Reuealed Will* to *Abraham*; yet (according to the iudgment of ſome learned (i) Proteſtants) it may be well interpreted, that when God willed by this act to try *Abraham*, the true meaning and intent both of *Gods* Will and wordes were truly to be performed in *Abraham*, by the only offering his ſonne vp in deuotion and fayth. And accordingly the Apoſtle ſayth. (*) *By fayth Abraham offered Iſaac when he was tempted.* Laſtly I ſay, admit, that *God* had a *Reuealed Will*, and a *Concealed Will*, touching the offering vp of *Iſaac*; Yet this is meerely impertinent to conuince, or proue, that God by his *Secret Will* determineth the *Reprobation* of any man, ordayning him euen from his Mothers wombe to damnation. And thus much concerning this Sub-

(i) *Amandus Polanus in Partition. Theolog. l. 1. pag. 184.*

(*) Heb. 11.

ject of *Reprobation*, defended with such a strong bent and vehemency, by diuers of our Aduersaries.

But now *Enthusiastus*, heer I giue a full stop to this our discourse: what my small talent in defence of these my former doctrines, and in impugning of yours, could affoard, I haue not beene (you see) sparing or nigard in making vse thereof, and this for the altering (and indeed bettering) of your iudgement. Now if I could discerne, that they haue wrought with you so forcibly, as I do couet, O how bountifully were my labour recompensed, & how larg a retaliation should I account it to be for any paines taken therein?

Your former wordes (and I hope, they doe not stand Neutrall to your mind, since such men were worthily (k) Rom. 3. rebuked, (k) *Qui linguis suis dolose agebant*) do partly encourage me, that my discourse hath not fallen vpon the stones, or on the barren ground, but that it hath somewhat wonne vpon your iudgment. And for your greater strengthening in the beliefe of these points, which I haue prooued in our former disputation for most true, Here

I do

I do witnes before the whole Court of Heauen, that if your contrery doctrines be true; *God doth seeme to cease to be God, and himselfe to renounce Himselfe:* Since he should then (by depriuing man of *Freewill*, and reprobating him to damnation, without any preuision of his workes,) seeme partly to relinquish and abandon his owne Essentiall & Incommunicable *Attributes* of *Goodnes* and *Mercy*.

Enthusiastus.

Learned *Arminius*. This your serious and zealous Protestation is not much needfull (so strong a battery & assault your Arguments haue already made vpon my Iudgment.) Therefore though I haue aboue giuen sufficient ouerture, how highly I prized your proofs, and how working they seemed with me to be: Neuertheless to withdraw the veyle, which you (perhaps) may feare to be betweene my former words, and my most retired and secret thoughts, Know you (*Arminius*, and this *learned Assembly*) that at this present I do freely vnbreast my selfe vnto you all, and do confesse in all candour

and

and sincerity, that I am conuinced in this our Conflict. I grant, that I haue lost the day (notwithstanding my former windy ventitation, and presumed confidence) so that you come off, with honour. But what? Is this in a true iudgment any disreputation to me? Noe. Since in being ouercome, I do ouercome, and in my Ouerthrow, I am Victorious, as now by this meanes triumphing ouer those Errours, to which my iudgment was afore enthralled. Let Truth euer preuaile: *Veritas* (m) *Domini manet in æternum.*

(m) Psal. 116.

Till the time of this our disputation, I graunt, I euer was most strong (I will not say pertinacious) in defence of my former doctrines, & euen my Centrall cogitations were euer that way fixed. But since my Cause lyes thus wholy prostrate by force of your former Authorities, I will for euer after repudiate (to which I was afore, as I may say, so much espoused) my former Errours, strongly tenting of *Innouation.* Neuer therfore more will I entertayne the least thought of them. And no more *Enthusiastes* will I be called, as tasting of aëry Illuminations, self-complacency,

cy, and believing in a mans owne Iudgment. *Orthodoxus* shall hereafter be my Name, I will decline (for the tyme to come) the obliquity of the paths of such men, who tread aside to all ancient times, and will be content to follow the Tract of Reuerend and gray-hayred *Antiquity*, especially seeing she doth anchour herselfe so firmely & immoueably vpon Gods sacred Word. I haue hitherto vnknowingly bene sick (though (n) *My sicknes hath not bene to death:*) Now I am healed: Giue me then leaue to congratulate my owne recouery, & suffer me with patience to launch forth a litle in words. (n) Iohn. 11.

My selfe am now cured by this learned Mans discourse, accounting it my honour to become his *Proselite*, or *Gentertite*: & I thirst to cure others, labouring with my former disease. O then, you *Worthy men* of my owne Nation, who did accompany me to this Mans presence, and I you out of *England*; I haue (I speake with griefe) often in my publike Sermons to you, and in my priuate discourses, inuenomed your Iudgments with these former dangerous *Theories* and Speculations: now

Cha-

Charity (o) *quæ ædificat, omnia credit,* (o) 1. Cor. 13.
omnia sperat, commands me to redeeme (what I can) the hurt already done: Suffer then for your owne good, that these my wordes may be an *Antidote* to your former poyson, by me distilled. Thinke, what it is to dismantle (as it were) and to disarme Man of *Freewill*: It is to resemble man (*made according to* (p) (Gen. 1.
the (p) *Image of the Highest*) or rather to transforme him vnto a *Beast*: who worketh nothing of himselfe, but only by the push of another (so the knife cutteth not of it selfe, but as a dead instrument moued by the hand.) In like sort, those other most pernicious *Theorems*, depending of the want of *Freewill*, (I meane the Positions of *Certainty of Salvation and Reprobation*) what most dangerous effects doe they worke in mans Soule? Do we not see by daily experience, that they open the sluce to all turpitude of manners and Sensuality?

That man who is persuaded that he wanteth *Freewill*, and that he is already, and vnalterably from all Eternity eyther *Predestinated* or *Reprobated*, what should stay him for ingulfyng himself in all enormous Crimes? May he not

vpon

vpon the grounds of his owne fayth thus iustly apologize for himselfe: I want *Freewill*; *The ten* (q) *Commandements of God do not belong to me: I am already either Predestinated to Heauen, or Reprobated to Hell: A vertuous life, if I be of the number of the Reprobate, cannot aduantage me; nor the most facinorous course can preiudice me, being Predestinated: Why then should I be so vnkynd, as deny my selfe the fruition of Pleasures, though neuer so much prohibited in Gods Word?* So thrall & mancipated must such a man be to all Sinne and flagitious Impiety.

(q) M. Fox Act. Mon. pag. 1135. and D. Willet in Synops. Pap. pag. 564.

This (no doubt) is the *Dialect* or language, in the which most men (beliewing the former doctrines) do expostulate with themselues in the secret of their owne Soules: And daily experiēce doth depose and sweare the certainty hereof.

And you, the *Learned Auditory here gathered together*. Happy you are in enioying the dayly Conference of this worthy man, who hath indoctrinated you in the Truth of these former dogmaticall Points. You see, how affluently, and abundantly he hath fortified these his doctrines from so many vn-

answer-

answerable Authorities of Gods holy word, and (besydes from other testimonies of Reason, and of the most learned Protestants) from all Venerable *Antiquity*, grounded heerein from the said word; which *Antiquity* through a long hand of Time, hath transmitted the truth thereof to *Posterity*. Keepe then this *Depositum* with an vnalterable Resolution; and thinke that man to be of a meretricious and frontlesse boldnes who dare oppose himselfe against the foresaid, both diuine and Humane Authorities.

And *England* (my most noble and deare Country) O that it were in my power, to dis-inchant their iudgments liuing in thee, of these pernicious doctrines, with which they stand yet bewitched! Is it not a point deseruing all commiseration and pitty, to obserue how many men in our owne Country of most eleuated Wits, and furnished with all variety of literature, do giue their full consent, for their belieuing of such exitiall and desperate doctrines? Desperate I call them, in regard of the most desperate attempts and actions, which diuers of the Belieuers of the

same

same doctrines, haue most inhumanly and vnnaturally perpetrated against themselues.

O how many, through perswasion that themselues are wholy *Reprobated* by God, and that it is not in their owne freedome of Will to concurre with Gods Grace, for the changing of their wicked liues, haue become their owne Butchers? Thy selfe, *My deare Country* (I speake it with vnutterable griefe) hath become the sable and mournfull Stage or *Theater*, vpon which diuers such lamentable *Tragedies* haue beene acted.

But (alas) why should man seeke to confine Gods Mercy, which is like himselfe, *Infinit, Endles*, and *Interminable: ab* (r) *aterno, & vsque in aternum, misericordia eius super timentes eum*? And what can discourage man from making his attonement with God, with whom, by truly and penitently confessing our selfe to be Sinners, we cease to be Sinners? Are any *Persons*, here exempted? No. For we reade, *Whosoeuer* (s) *shall depart from his wicked wayes, and turne to me, I will receiue him*. Is any *time* limited or prefixed for receiuing his *Mercy*?

(r) Psalm. 103.

(s) Ezech. 18.

Heare what is said: *At what* (t) *day soe-*
(t) Ezech. 33. *uer an impious man shall returne unto me*
from his impiety, his wickednes shall not hurt
him. Finally, as there any sort, or *kind of*
sinnes excepted out of this bountiful
grant and Indulgence of God? Nothing
(u) Esay. 1. lesse: *Yf your* (u) *sinnes were as redd as*
scarlet, they shall be made as white as snow.
Seing then neither *Person*, nor *Tyme*,
nor *Sinne* is excluded out of this most
large and ample Pardon; why should
not euery one (euen loathing that most
despayring doctrine of *Reprobation*, so
much dishonorable and detractory to
the boundles Mercy of God) with all
assured confidence and erected Hope,
(x) 2. Cor. 2. make his refuge to him, who is *Pater* (x)
misericordiarum? But I feare, I haue
cloyed your eares (*Arminius*, and this
Worthy Presence) with a tedious dis-
course; and therefore seing the day is
far spent, we must leaue you, and your
Auditory (reseruing a fitter oportunity
for the seing of your *Vniuersity*) and ha-
sten back to the *Hage*.

Arminius.

Good *Enthusiastus*, I much reioyce,
that my speaches haue had that woe-

king Influence ouer your iudgment, as it seemeth by you, they haue: whereby you haue forsaken those *Colours* of *faith* and *doctrine*, vnder which hitherto you haue serued. I pray God that such of your worthy company heere, who yet stand aduerse in doctrine to me, may reape the like benefit by this our discourse. That you are to depart so soone, I much grieue: and rest much doubtfull, whether we shall euer see one another agayne, during this tyme of our peregrination. But if so you be willing thereto, after your returne into *England*, we will in part supply the want of corporall familiarity by intercourse of mutuall and friendly letters; by meanes whereof we may enioy (*as absently present*) the one the other: (y) *Absens absentem & video, & audio.* (y) Virg.

Enthusiastus.

Most willingly I accord thereto: and with this, these *Gentlemen* and I, take of you, and of this your *Auditory*, our last *Farewell.*

Arminius.

Nay, you shall giue me leaue to conduct you to the Gates of this our Vniuersity. Whither hauing brought you, *Enthusiastus*, and these *Gentlemen* of Worth, I will take my last leaue, my Prayers and best wishes shall attend you to your iourneys end.

Enthusiastus.

Once more then, *Arminius*, Company and I, giue you our best *Farewell.*

FINIS.

God saue the King.